This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Harvard Depository
Brittle Book

405. m. c. Oehler

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CLARK'S

FOREIGN

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

FOURTH SERIES.

VOL. XLVIII.

Oehler's Theology of the Old Testament.

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1875.

Digitized by Google

PRINTED BY MURRAY AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, . . .	HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.
DUBLIN, . . .	JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.
NEW YORK, . . .	SCRIBNER, WELFORD, AND ARMSTRONG.

Digitized by Google

THEOLOGY

OF

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY

DR. GUST. FR. OEHLER,

LATE PROFESSOR ORDINARIUS OF THEOLOGY IN TÜBINGEN.

VOLUME II.

TRANSLATED BY

SOPHIA TAYLOR.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

1875.

Digitized by Google

30,226.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

PART I.—DIVISION III.—CHAPTER II.—SECOND DOCTRINE.

PAGE

II. On the Various Kinds of Offerings, with reference to their Purpose—*continued*, ... 1
Of Vows, ... 13
Appendix (Theocratic Tributes and Atoning Sacrifices), . 25
III. The Sacred Seasons, ... 68

PART II.—PROPHETISM.

FIRST SECTION: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEOCRACY, FROM THE DEATH OF JOSHUA TO THE CLOSE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT REVELATION.

First Division: The Times of the Judges, ... 123
I. The Disintegration of the Theocracy till the Times of Samuel, ... 123
II. Restoration of the Theocratic Unity by Samuel—Growth of Prophetism—Foundation of the Monarchy, . . 137

Second Division: Period of the Undivided Kingdom, . . 153
I. Saul, ... 153
II. David, ... 156
III. Solomon, ... 169

Third Division: The Kingdom of the Ten Tribes, . . . 184
First Period: From Jeroboam I. to the Overthrow of the Dynasty of Omri, ... 185
Second Period: From Jehu to the Overthrow of the Kingdom of the Ten Tribes, ... 197

Digitized by Google

PAGE

Fourth Division: The Kingdom of Judah, ... 206
First Period: From Rehoboam to Ahaz, ... 210
Second Period: From Ahaz to Josiah, ... 219
Third Period: From Josiah to the Overthrow of the State, . 229

Fifth Division: History of the Jewish Nation from the Babylonian Captivity to the Cessation of Prophecy, ... 245

SECOND SECTION: THE THEOLOGY OF PROPHETISM.

First Division: The Doctrine of the Lord of Hosts and of Angels, . 270

Second Division: Man's Religious and Moral Relation to God, . 293
I. Distinction between the Ceremonial and the Moral Law, . 293
II. The Ruinous Nature of Sin—The Need of a New Dispensation of Grace, ... 299
III. Justification by Faith, ... 305

Third Division: Of Prophecy, ... 318
First Subdivision: The Prophetic Consciousness, . . 318
Second Subdivision: Of Prophecy, ... 345

Fourth Division: Of the Kingdom of God, ... 362
First Subdivision: The Purpose of God's Kingdom—The Contradiction thereto presented by the Present—The Abolition of this Contradiction by Judgment, ... 363
I. The Design of God's Kingdom, ... 363
II. The Relation of the Present to the Purpose of the Divine Kingdom, ... 366
III. The Judgment, ... 370
Second Subdivision: The Future Redemption, . . . 378
I. The Deliverance and Restoration of the Covenant People, ... 378
II. The Admission of the Heathen into the Kingdom of God, ... 398
III. The Messiah, ... 406

Digitized by Google

PART III.—OLD TESTAMENT WISDOM.

PAGE

SECTION I. Objective Divine Wisdom, ... 439

SECTION II. Subjective Human Wisdom, ... 446

SECTION III. Moral Good, ... 453

SECTION IV. The Enigmas of Human Life—The Struggle for their Solution, ... 463

SECTION V. Renunciation of the Solution in the Book of Ecclesiastes, 479

ERRATUM in VOL. I. page 85, line 3 from top.

For "see in Keil," read "see Schrader, *die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*. Giessen, 1872, p. 42; p. 383."

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

SECOND DOCTRINE—CONTINUED.

THE MOSAIC CULTUS.

3. ON THE VARIOUS KINDS OF OFFERINGS WITH REFERENCE TO THEIR PURPOSE—*continued.*

(*b*) THE PEACE-OFFERING.

§ 132.

Its Name, Notion, and Division.

THE name of this sacrifice (זֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים) (1) may be explained in a twofold manner. According to the rabbinic view (2), it is derived from the Kal שָׁלֵם, *integer fuit*, to be unharmed. Hence שְׁלֻמִי, Ps. vii. 4, he who is in a peaceful or friendly relation to me. This makes the name of the sacrifice declare that the offerer is in a relation of integrity, a relation of peace and friendship with God. Hence the LXX. already render the words by *εἰρηνικὴ θυσία* and sometimes by *σωτήριον*, the Vulgate by *sacrificia pacifica* (3), moderns by peace-offering. That such a notion is at all events included in that of the peace-offering, is evident from the fact that, in those cases in which these sacrifices appear in conjunction with sin-offerings, the latter (as also burnt-offerings) are to be offered first; comp. Lev. ix. 18, Num. vi. 16, etc. Thus the peace-offering is manifestly a declaration that a relation of perfect peace between the Lord and the offerer is restored by means of the atonement effected. The *second* explanation of the expression (4) refers it to the Piel שִׁלֵּם, *to compensate*, to which the noun שֶׁלֶם is said to be related in the same manner as כֹּפֶר, atonement, to כִּפֻּר (5). In behalf of this explanation, it may be advanced that the Piel שִׁלֵּם is the technical term for the act of offering this sacrifice, for it is frequently used in combination

Digitized by Google

with נְדָרִים (vows, which are a kind of שְׁלָמִים), Deut. xxiii. 22, etc., and also with תּוֹדוֹת (offerings of thanksgiving), Ps. lvi. 13; nay, in Hos. xiv. 2, to offer calves as peace-offerings is called שַׁלֵּם פָּרִים. Care must however be taken, if this derivation is adopted, not to limit the שְׁלָמִים to the specific notion of the *thank-offering*, for the former not only include the *sacrificia eucharistica*, but undoubtedly also the *sacrificia impetratoria*, the supplicatory offerings; for which reason peace-offerings are offered, *e.g.* 1 Sam. xiii. 9, before commencing a battle, and Judg. xx. 26, xxi. 4, 2 Sam. xxiv. 25, when public misfortunes had been suffered. Hence the notion of the שֶׁלֶם must be understood in a more general sense as a return not only for some benefit already obtained, but also for one still desired; in short, as a testimony that to God alone are we indebted for whatever we receive or hope for (6). These offerings were called זְבָחִים (זָבַח signifying to slay with reference to eating), because a sacrificial repast was one of their essential elements, while the consumption of the entire sacrifice on the altar was peculiar to the burnt-offering (7). In the Pentateuch this narrower use of זָבַח is adhered to, the word being never there used of an atoning sacrifice; nor can such usage be proved of the subsequent books of the Old Testament (8), for in Ps. li. 18 the thank-offerings of the justified (Hupfeld, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch) are spoken of (9).

With respect to the *division* of the peace-offerings, various opinions have also been entertained, the chief passage in this respect, Lev. vii. 11 sqq., allowing of different interpretations. According to Hengstenberg (*Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1852, p. 134), the term used, ver. 12 sq., זֶבַח עַל־תּוֹדָה (sacrifice of thanksgiving, *A. V.*), does not designate one kind of peace-offering, but is another name for the whole species, and denotes the emotions which are incorporated by these sacrifices. Hence there would be only two kinds of peace-offerings (comp. xxii. 18, 21), viz. נְדָרִים and נְדָבוֹת, both being תּוֹדָה (on account of thankfulness), comp. Ps. liv. 8, lvi. 13, cvi. 18 (10). According to the

Digitized by Google

usual and correct view, *three kinds* are distinguished in the above-cited passage of Leviticus, viz. 1, זֶבַח תּוֹדָה (or, as it is called, vers. 13 and 15, זֶבַח תּוֹדַת שְׁלָמִים), the thank or praise offering; 2, נֶדֶר, the vow; and 3, נְדָבָה, the free-will offering. The difference, however, between the thank-offering and the two others can hardly be so defined (as by Ewald, *Alterthümer*, 1st ed. p. 55, 3d ed. p. 71) as to make the latter a sacrifice of greater solemnity and excellence because of the psalms and hymns with which the singers and musicians accompanied it. On the contrary, it was probably this: the זֶבַח תּוֹדָה being offered without having been previously promised for some benefit received, and thus referring to a favour not already supplicated (11), was the highest among the שְׁלָמִים. The vow נֶדֶר, on the contrary, is a promised offering usually presented after the reception of some benefit previously entreated. And lastly, the נְדָבָה is every free gift for which there was no other occasion than the will of the offerer, whom his heart impelled to show his thankful sense of all the blessings which the goodness of God had bestowed on him. Comp. especially Deut. xvi. 10; and in explanation of the expression, Ex. xxxv. 29 (אֲשֶׁר נָדַב לִבָּם אֹתָם) and xxv. 2 (אֲשֶׁר יִדְּבֶנּוּ לִבּוֹ). The נְדָבָה, of which a general feeling of love to God is the impelling cause, would thus be contrasted not merely with the obligation laid upon the offerer by a vow, but also with sacrifices occasioned by some special benefit (12). In the two first kinds, the precepts concerning the unblemished nature of the victim were to be observed, the requirements being, according to Lev. xxii. 23, less strict in the case of the נְדָבָה (13).

(1) A single offering of this kind is thus designated in the Pentateuch. The singular שֶׁלֶם only occurs in the Old Testament in Amos v. 22.

(2) Embraced, among moderns, especially by Neumann, *Sacra N. T. salutaria*, 1854, p. 18 sqq.

(3) The only fault to be found with the latter translation is that it makes it appear as if peace were not made with God until this sacrifice was offered, while in fact the offering presup-

Digitized by Google

poses that this peace already exists, and is intended only to confirm and strengthen it.

(4) This view has recently been advocated by Hofmann; comp. his apt remarks in his *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1, 1st ed. p. 145, 2d ed. p. 227, and by Knobel on Lev. iii. 1.

(5) On the frequent coincidence in meaning of nouns derived from the Kal, with the Piel of their verb, comp. Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrb. der Hebr. Sprache*, § 150*b*.

(6) Just as in the Psalms God is frequently thanked beforehand for help which is expected, and as שְׁחַד, שַׁלְמֹנִים, Isa. i. 23, Mic. vii. 3, signifies a remuneration to the judge for some favour to be granted (comp. Hofmann, *ib.*). But even in this view of the שֶׁלֶם the fact must not be lost sight of, that this offering presupposes the existence of a friendly relation between God and the offerer, and is intended to express his thankfulness for manifestations of Divine goodness bestowed or to be bestowed on account of this relation.

(7) For the meaning of זָבַח, to slay with reference to eating, comp. especially Lev. xvii. 3 sqq., Deut. xii. 15.

(8) In the subsequent books of the Old Testament, זֶבַח is occasionally used in a wider sense, signifying sometimes (especially when combined with מִנְחָה) bloody sacrifices in general, sometimes such sacrifices with the exclusion of the עֹלָה. Still the examples adduced by Gusset, *lex Hebr.* ed. 2, 415, Neumann, *id.* sqq., and others, require much sifting, and many passages where the wider meaning has been embraced refer only to the שַׁלְמִים.

(9) Moreover, no sin-offering might be brought for blood-guiltiness. So too only Shelamim can be intended by זֶבַח in Jer. vii. 22, as shown by ver. 21, and in xvii. 26, as proved by the connection.

(10) This view makes it impossible to understand the injunction concerning the flesh of the sacrifice, Lev. vii. 15 in its relation with 16–18, in its natural meaning. Besides, it must be observed that a זֶבַח, differing from the נְדָרִים and נְדָבוֹת, is also mentioned xxiii. 37 and Deut. xii. 6.

(11) Properly a sacrifice of confession (according to the original meaning of תּוֹדָה), of grateful acknowledgment for Divine favours as undeserved as they were unexpected.

Digitized by Google

(12) These distinctions are, for want of more exact definitions, comparatively conjectural.

(13) Even animals with limbs abnormally large or small might be offered. Free-will offerings of money for the repair of the sanctuary and its vessels were also reckoned among the נְדָבוֹת in their wider sense (Ex. xxv. 2, xxxv. 21). The only remark to be made on the material of the peace-offering is that cattle, sheep, or goats of *both sexes* might be used (Lev. iii. 6), though even here preference seems to have been given to males (comp. such passages as ix. 4, 18, Num. vii. 17 sqq.), and that pigeons are never mentioned. The peace-offering was, like the burnt-offering, accompanied by a meat and a drink offering, for it is evident from Num. xv. 3 that what is prescribed concerning the sacrifice of thanksgiving, Lev. vii. 12, applies also to the other two kinds.

§ 133.

The Ritual of the Peace-Offering.

In the ritual of the peace-offering, the proceedings were, down to and including the sprinkling of the blood, identical with those practised at the burnt-offering (comp. Lev. iii. 2), except that, as already remarked, § 126, the slaying of the animal was not restricted to the north side of the altar. On the other hand, a proceeding essentially differing from the ritual of the burnt-offering made its appearance after the sprinkling of the blood. The whole animal was not placed upon the altar, but the fat alone was removed at the cutting up of the animal and afterwards burnt (Lev. iii. 3–5, 9–11, 14–16, ix. 19 sq.). This fat consisted, in the case of oxen and goats, of four, in that of sheep, of five parts (1). The fat interspersed in the flesh was not sacrificed, and the prohibition of fat as food relates only to these separable portions (Lev. vii. 23–25) (2). The reason for burning these fatty portions on the altar was that they were regarded as the choice parts of the animal (3). After the removal of the fat, the offerer of a private peace-offering was to bring with his own hand not only this, but also the wave-

Digitized by Google

breast (חָזֶה) (4) and the right שׁוֹק (according to the general view—LXX. *βραχίων*; Vulgate, *arma*—the right shoulder, therefore a fore leg; according to Knobel, the right hind leg, the right thigh) to the priest as a heave-offering (Lev. vii. 29–34). This brings us to discuss the ceremony of the waving or swinging (תְּנוּפָה, הֲנִיפָה), as well as the question, what relation this had to that of heaving (תְּרוּמָה, הֲרִים). Besides the case just mentioned, the former occurred also at the peace-offerings enjoined at the consecration of priests (Lev. vii. 29–34) and the dedication of Nazarites (Num. vi. 20), at the jealousy-offering (ver. 25), at the trespass-offering of the leper (Lev. xiv. 12), at the offering of the sheaf of new corn at the Passover, and the loaves of first-ripe corn and peace-offering lambs at the Feast of Weeks (5). According to Jewish tradition, which coincides with the intimations given (Ex. xxix. 24, Lev. viii. 27, etc.), it consisted in the priest laying the matter to be waved upon the hands of the offerer (6), placing his hands under those of the latter, and moving them in a horizontal direction—backwards and forwards, according to the Talmud (מוֹלִיךְ וּמֵבִיא), and also towards the right and left, that is, towards the four quarters of the heavens, according to some later Rabbis (7). Of the *meaning* of the transaction, in the simpler form in which the Talmud describes it, no doubt can exist, when it is considered that the waving took place almost exclusively in the case of such portions of sacrifices as were allotted to the priests as a gift from Jehovah (8). The swinging forwards evidently denoted the presentation of the gift to God,—it was a declaration in action that it properly belonged to Him; while the moving it backwards again expressed that God on His part returned the gift, and assigned it to the priest. In the view connected, on the other hand, with the rabbinical explanation, according to which the ceremony is said to allude to the universal government of God (9), it is not easy to perceive why such an acknowledgment of the Divine omnipresence (as Sykes, *über die Opfer*, edited by Semler,

Digitized by Google

pp. 36, 54, designates the wave-offering) should take place just with those portions of the sacrifices which were relinquished to the priests (10). We next proceed to the *heaving*, which also, according to most of the Rabbis, who are followed in this respect by many moderns, particularly by Kurtz, was a special ceremony, a moving upwards and downwards of portions of the sacrifice with reference to the God who rules in heaven and on earth. It was in some instances combined with the wave-offering, in others practised independently, viz. in the case of those portions of a sacrifice which were burnt as exclusively belonging to God, the memorial (*askarah*, of the meat-offering and the fat, Lev. ii. 9, iv. 8, 10, etc.), whence it has been remarked that, generally speaking, heaving and burning appear in combination. The ceremony of heaving likewise took place with the above-named heave-shoulder (הַתְּרוּמָה שׁוֹק). Unquestionably a separate ceremony of heaving occurs in the later Jewish ritual, but this cannot be pointed out in the Pentateuch (11). Especially is it to be observed that in the passages on sacrifice, הֵרִים is never combined with אֶל־יְהוָה, or, as הֵנִיף is, with לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, but with לַיהוָה (we also meet with תְּרוּמַת יְהוָה, the heave belonging to Jehovah), and that the מִן partitive is generally used with the word, to specify from what whole the heave is to be taken (comp. Lev. ii. 9, iv. 8, 10, vi. 8, etc.) (12). The expression תְּרוּמָה, moreover, elsewhere signifies nothing else than what is taken away, what is separated from the whole to be offered to the Lord. In this sense it is used of the first-born, the tenth, the devoted, the Lord's share of the spoil (Num. xv. 19 sq., xviii. 11 sq., xxxi. 41, etc.), the word denoting in general the sacred tribute (comp. Lev. xxii. 12; Num. v. 9) (13). This meaning is also suitable in the passages concerning sacrifice; nor are we obliged in a single instance to accept a special ceremony of heaving. Thus תְּרוּמַת שׁוֹק also is the shoulder or thigh, which, after the Lord has received His part and relinquished the breast of it to the priest, is relinquished or taken off on the part of the offerer

Digitized by Google

in favour of the officiating priest (14). After the separation of the wave-breast, the rest of the flesh was the portion of the offerers (15), to be used by them as a sacrificial feast in the sanctuary, in which all the members of their families and other guests might participate. Levitical cleanness was indispensable in all who ate of the sacrifices; any one who should, in spite of any uncleanness he might have incurred, eat thereof, was to be cut off. In the case of the thank-offering, the flesh was to be consumed on the same day (vii. 15, xxii. 29 sq.); in that of other sacrifices, on the second at furthest; if any remained till the third day, it was to be burned (vii. 16 sq., xix. 6 sq.) (16). The signification of this sacrificial repast was not (as Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. p. 374, and others suppose) that Jehovah, as proprietor of the flesh which was offered, was the host, and they who fed thereon His guests; on the contrary, it was rather God who condescended to be the guest of the offerer, receiving the breast as His portion of honour, and then relinquishing it to His servant the priest. Thus the repast was *a pledge of the blessed fellowship* into which He would enter with His people among whom He dwelt (17). It was also to be a *love-feast*, at which, besides the members of the family, the Levites (Deut. xii. 18) and (as prescribed, Deut. xvi. 11, in the case of the peace-offerings at Pentecost) the needy were to find refreshment. Niggardliness was prevented by the prohibition of a longer keeping of the flesh; still the principal reason of the injunction to consume it before the third day, may have lain in the likelihood of corruption taking place (18).

(1) In oxen and goats it consisted of the fat covering the intestines (חֵלֶב), the fat upon the intestines, the two kidneys with their fat, and finally, the caul of the liver (so Luther, De Wette, and Knobel; on the other hand, most moderns understand by יֹתֶרֶת עַל־הַכָּבֵד the great upper lobe of the liver). In sheep, the fat tail was added as a fifth piece. It seems needless here to go into farther particulars concerning the meaning of these somewhat disputed expressions.

Digitized by Google

(2) The prohibition did not relate to the fat of other eatable animals, such as deer. Hence the statement, sometimes made, that fat, as well as the blood, was among the articles of food forbidden by the Mosaic law, is incorrect. The passage, Lev. viii. 25, expressly says, "Whosoever eateth the fat of the beast of which men offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord."

(3) "*Flos carnis*," Neumann's above-named work, p. 35 Thus, generally speaking, it was the best and most nourishing part which was to be offered to God, on which account the Hebrew gave a very wide extent to the term חֵלֶב (Gen. xlv. 18; Num. xviii. 12; Deut. xxxii. 14, etc.). Keil insists on seeing also in the fat a symbol of the inward man. But if a symbol were here in question, should we not expect that the heart, which Scripture represents as the seat of life, would have been offered? Finally, the opinion of Maimonides, that the fat was denied to man and destined to be burnt on the altar on dietetic grounds, has been aptly opposed by Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii. p. 382) in the remark, "Is the Lord to have what man cannot use—what would disagree with him?"

(4) "The breast, which in oxen, sheep, and goats is called the brisket, consists mostly of gristly fat, and is one of the best-flavoured portions" (Knobel).

(5) In the case both of the last named and of the trespass-offering lamb of the leper, it took place with the whole animal *before* it was slain. In *Thosaphta Menachoth*, viii. 6 (Ugolino, *Thesaur.* xix. p. 675, comp. Reland, *Ant.* iii. 1. 17), the matter is thus defined:—1. Private peace-offerings—laying on of the hand before slaying, waving afterwards; 2. Public peace-offerings—no laying on of the hand, waving both before and after slaying; 3. Trespass-offering of the leper—waving and laying on of the hand before slaying.

(6) With respect to this part of the transaction, the LXX. denote it by ἐπιτιθέναι, ἐπίθεμα.

(7) See the passages from later Rabbis in Outram, *id.* p. 151 sq.—On the form of waving at the consecration of Levites, see § 94. Rabbinical tradition, founded on a misunderstanding of Ex. xxix. 27, hereafter to be discussed, connects also the heaving upwards and downwards (תְּנוּפָה וּתְרוּמָה) with the manipulation of waving (*Menachoth*, v. 6; *Thosaphta Menachoth*, vii. 9, in Ugol. p. 671, etc.), and consequently

Digitized by Google

represents the portions of the sacrifice as swung in four or in six directions.

(8) This refers also, according to Num. viii. 19, to the wave of the Levites.—On the meaning of the ceremony, Lev. viii. 25 sq., see § 95.

(9) *Deo omnia implenti, omnia tuenti et possidenti victima rite porrecta fuit* (Witsius, *Miscell.* i. p. 403).

(10) Compare on this point especially Keil, *Archæol.* i. p. 253.

(11) In this respect I entirely coincide with Knobel on Lev. vii. 33, in opposition to Kurtz. Comp. also on this point, Keil, *Archæol.* p. 244 sq.; Gesenius, too, who in his *Thesaurus*, ii. p. 866, embraced the usual view, subsequently renounced it, iii. p. 1277.

(12) The מִן הֵרִים, Lev. ii. 9, corresponds with the מִן קֶמֶץ of ver. 2, and the הוּסַר, in vers. 31 and 35, with the הוּרַם in Lev. iv. 10.

(13) With this corresponds also the later use of the word, Isa. xl. 20, and in Ezekiel. In the latter, הֵרִים תְּרוּמָה stands, ch. xlv. 1, xlviii. 8, 12, 20, for the portions of land set apart for Jehovah (for the temple and priests), and ch. xlv. 13, for the oblations to be given to the prince for distribution in sacrifices. Comp. finally, Ezra viii. 25. The LXX. translate it in Ex. xxv. 2 sq., where it is used of the gifts for the making of the tabernacle, by *ἀπαρχή*; in the parallel passages, xxxv. 21, xxxvi. 3, by *ἀφαίρεμα*; and only in xxx. 13 sq., where it stands for the offering of the half shekel for the sanctuary, by *εἰσφορά* (Onkelos in all these passages, by אפרשותא). They have indeed hit the right meaning when they also translate הֵרִים, Lev. ii. 9, by *ἀφαιρεῖν*, and iv. 8 by *περιαιρεῖν*, etc.

(14) The juxtaposition of the הוּנַף and the הוּרַם in Ex. xxix. 27 does not prove, since each of the two relative clauses refers to a different object, that the latter denotes a ceremony identical with waving, in which case it would be indifferent whether מְאֵיל הַמִּלֻּאִים were combined, as in the LXX., with הוּרַם or with וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ. Finally, it must be considered that תְּנוּפָה also appears with the general meaning "offering" in Ex. xxxv. 22, xxxviii. 24, for the gold used for the sanctuary, while only תְּרוּמָה stands for the silver and brass, because here the point of view embraced is that what was brought was but a portion removed from the mass. The wave-breast and heave-shoulder

Digitized by Google

allotted to the priest might be eaten by him, after being boiled or roasted in a clean place (not necessarily the sanctuary), Lev. x. 14. Deut. xviii. 3 seems to offer a difficulty, since, according to this passage, the priest's due, מֵאֵת חָעָם מֵאֵת זֹבְחֵי הַזָּבַח, whether of ox or sheep, was to be the shoulder, the two cheeks, and the maw. Many (comp. Riehm, *die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, p. 41 sq.) see in the passage an alteration of the portions of offerings appointed by former laws. The evident reference, however, of vers. 1 and 2 to Num. xviii. 20, decidedly gives the impression that the passage is an addition to earlier appointments. Besides what is granted to the priests by the Lord, inasmuch as He will be their נַחֲלָה, a gift of respect on the part of the people is also allotted them. In this sense the reference of the passage to the peace-offering presents no difficulty; and a confirmation of this reference may be seen in 1 Sam. ii. 13 sq. (see Schultz, *das Deuteronomium erklärt*, p. 59). Jewish tradition, however, so far as it can be followed up (Josephus, *Ant.* iv. 4. 4; Philo, *de sacerd. hon.* § 3; *Mishna Cholin*, x. 1; comp. Ranke, *Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch*, ii. p. 290 sq.), has regarded this passage as prescribing the bestowal of a portion of animals *slaughtered for ordinary use* (Philo: *ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξω τοῦ βωμοῦ θυομένων*; or, as the Mishna expresses it, this tribute was to be given from the חוּלִין, the profane, under which point of view (xi. 1) the first-fruits of the sheep-shearing, mentioned Deut. xviii. 4, are also regarded); and this precept may be most simply explained by the fact (Ranke, p. 295) that a compensation was to be given to the priests for the loss of revenue they sustained by the alteration of the law of Lev. xvii. 1–9, contained in Deut. xii. When Riehm opposes to this view of the passage the impracticability of such a precept, we must consider, on the other hand, that an obligation to bring or send the prescribed portions of a slaughtered animal to the sanctuary is out of the question,—Jewish tradition also reckoning this tribute as belonging to the קדשי הנבול, and as among those which might be brought to any priest whatever. The tribute might be sent to a priest's city, or to any priest staying in the neighbourhood. That the observance of this precept was omitted where there was no opportunity of observing it, may be as reasonably concluded as *e.g.* the self-evident fact that the command to invite the Levites to

Digitized by Google

the feast of the tenth rests on the assumption that Levites are actually to be found in the neighbourhood. The question why just these three portions of a slaughtered animal were to be given, has been variously answered. The most simple explanation is that of Fagius, that these represent the three chief divisions of the animal, head, trunk, and feet, of which they formed parts (article *Priesterthum im A. T.*). Of the meat-offering, which was combined with the peace-offering, the priest was to receive one cake (Lev. vii. 14, probably one of each of the three kinds mentioned, ver. 12), undoubtedly after the memorial (*askarah*) had, according to the precept (ii. 9), been first burned (art. *Opferkultus des A. T.*).

(15) This was the case without exception in *private* peace-offerings. In *public* peace-offerings, all the flesh of the sacrificed animals, except the portions of fat, went, according to the usual view, to the priests. This is, however, expressly said only of the two lambs of the pentecostal peace-offerings (xxiii. 30); and Keil (in his above-cited work, p. 245 sq.), opposing the application of this rule to all public peace-offerings, justly appeals to Deut. xxvii. 7, where, besides the public peace-offerings, the repasts of the people are also spoken of, and to 1 Kings viii. 36, according to which Solomon offered at the dedication of the temple 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep, which it was quite impossible that the priests alone could consume, and finally suggests that, with the exception of the pentecostal sacrifices, the peace-offerings at festivals were voluntary gifts.

(16) This was also prescribed with respect to such flesh of sacrifices as had come in contact with anything unclean (Lev. vii. 19). The fact that the peace-offering terminated in a repast explains the circumstance that, according to Lev. vii. 13, besides the unleavened bread of the meat-offering, leavened bread was also to be offered, which, however, was not laid on the altar, but only eaten with the flesh at the ensuing meal. It is utterly unnecessary to understand the passage as expressing that the unleavened meat-offering itself was offered upon a layer of leavened bread. See Knobel on the passage.

(17) It is self-evident that cleanness was exacted of all participators in such an act of communion; its opposite would have been an act of flagrant contempt on the part of the invited guests, hence the threat of severe punishment.

Digitized by Google

(18) This danger of uncleanness would naturally be most strictly avoided in the case of the thank-offering, as pre-eminent among the peace-offerings.

§ 134.

Of Vows (1).

The *notion of the vow* extends much farther than to those vowed sacrifices properly so called (discussed in § 132). For the vow *positive*, the promise to dedicate something to God may refer not merely to a sacrifice, but to the dedication of some other object; and besides this, there is the vow *negative*, the promise to renounce some act or enjoyment for the glory of God. It is only with reference to the positive vow that the word נֶדֶר is used in the law (with the exception of Num. vi. 5), while the negative vow (the forswearing, as it has been called, in opposition to swearing) is designated by אִסָּר or אֱסָר, *obligatio* (Num. xxx. 3 sq.), or more fully by שְׁבֻעַת אִסָּר לְעַנּוֹת נָפֶשׁ (ver. 14).—The positive vow first appears in the Old Testament in Gen. xxviii. 20–22, as a promise to erect a place of worship, and might extend to persons, even the person of the vower, to animals and to lands. Persons were dedicated to the service of the sanctuary (thus Hannah vowed her son, 1 Sam. i. 11); and it is probably on this ground that the circumstance of women being employed in the sanctuary (Ex. xxxviii. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 22 (2)) is to be explained. Persons and lands *might* (3), unclean animals *must*, be redeemed at an appointed valuation—see the law, Lev. xxvii. 1–25 (4); clean animals, on the other hand, which had been vowed, were always to be sacrificed (ver. 9 sq.). Of course that which was already due to God (ver. 26) could not become the subject of a vow, neither could aught connected with crime or infamy; comp. Deut. xxiii. 18 (5). Anything which had fallen under the curse could only be the subject of the חֵרֶם. This word signifies "a being cut off," *i.e.* from the ordinary connection of life; for to be subjected to the

Digitized by Google

Cherem, the vow of extermination, is to have forfeited existence. The Cherem might be carried into execution either in consequence of a Divine command or of a special kind of vow, *the vow of devotion;* comp., as the chief passage on this subject, Lev. xxvii. 28 sq. Nothing devoted could be redeemed. If the vow related to anything living, it must be put to death (6); lands which had been devoted were irredeemable and unsaleable, the priests having the right of possession, see ver. 21 (7). Of course this vow, the Cherem, might not be arbitrarily vowed, otherwise the laws of imprecation would have been in irreconcilable opposition to other laws. Only (as may be inferred from Ex. xxii. 19, Deut. xiii. 16) that which had incurred the judgment due to idolatry could be thus placed under the ban. Hence the vow of extermination must be regarded as a *manifestation of zeal for Jehovah's honour.*

Among vows of abstinence, the most usual was that of *fasting*, which, except on the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 29, xxiii. 27, of which hereafter, § 140), was quite voluntary, and therefore often appears as the expression of penitence (comp. *e.g.* 1 Sam. vii. 6, Joel ii. 12, etc.), or of mourning in general. It is not till after the captivity that we meet with various other annual fasts (of which hereafter). The Pentateuch makes use of the expression עִנּוֹת נֶפֶשׁ (compare, besides the already quoted passages, Num. xxx. 14), to bow the soul, for fasting (8), in which the special significance of fasting is expressed; some indulgence, otherwise allowable, must be denied to the natural will to testify to the earnestness of its penitence and grief. It is characteristic of the moral spirit of Mosaism, that it strictly forbids all unnatural austerities, such as maiming or mutilating the limbs, branding, and the like (Lev. xix. 28; Deut. xiv. 1 sq., xxiii. 2 sq.), for it is said, Deut. xix. 1 sq., "Thou art an holy people." (Eunuchs were on this account excluded from the congregation.)

The permission of vows is best understood in its subjective aspect, from the pedagogic standpoint of the law. To be bound by an oath might support the weakness and fickleness of

Digitized by Google

the natural will, and give energy to a prayer or a resolution. Still a vow was never regarded as specially meritorious. "If thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin unto thee," Deut. xxiii. 22. Of course, if a vow were once made, its performance was strictly insisted on, Num. xxx. 3, Deut. xxiii. 22–24 (9); at the same time, however, it was enacted that the vow of a daughter in her father's house, or of a wife, was only binding if her father or husband confirmed it by silence (10). Inconsiderate vows are expressly reproved, Prov. xx. 25, and Eccl. v. 3–5. The heathen view of a vow, as forming a kind of compact with the Deity, by means of which a claim upon Divine interposition was acquired on the part of him who makes it, may indeed be found in the form of the Old Testament vow (if thou doest so to me, I will do so and so) from Gen. xxviii. 20 sq. onwards; but the notion that God will be influenced to grant a petition by an external performance as such, is opposed, Ps. lxvi. 18, by the words, "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me," after the fulfilment of vows had been previously spoken of, vers. 13–15; while in Ps. l. 14, also, the offering of *thanksgiving* is regarded as the right fulfilment of vows (11).

(1) Comp. my article, *Gelübde bei den Hebräern*, in Herzog's *Realencycl.* xiv. p. 788 sqq.

(2) The sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter, however, is not to be included here. Whether the *Nethinim*, so frequently mentioned in the later historical books as permanently appointed to the temple service, were among such devoted persons, cannot be determined; generally, however, their origin was undoubtedly a different one. See on both points the Historical Section in "Prophetism."

(3) According to Saalschütz, *mos. Recht*, p. 363, the law not only allowed the redemption of a devoted person, but regarded this as the sole purport of the oath. Hence the consignment of the individual to the service of the sanctuary was out of the question, and all that was contemplated by such a vow was the payment of a certain sum of money. This view is compatible with Lev. xxvii. 2 sq., inasmuch as the opposite is not there brought forth as in ver. 15 sq. (comp. Philo, *de spec. leg.* § 8).

Digitized by Google

From 1 Sam. i. 11, 22, 28, however, it is evident that the actual dedication of a person to the service of the sanctuary was permitted.

(4) For persons, the price of redemption differed according to age and sex; in the case of the poor, it was also determined according to property, Lev. xxvii. 1–8. For unclean animals, houses, and hereditary land, the price was determined by the priests (in hereditary lands, according to the probable value of the crops until the year of jubilee). Upon redemption, however, a fifth was added to the estimated value. If an inherited field were not redeemed, it might be alienated, and in the year of jubilee would devolve not to its former possessor, but to the priests, ver. 20 sq. (comp. § 151, note 21). If the field were, on the contrary, one obtained by purchase, it returned at the year of jubilee to its former possessor, vers. 22–24. (Subsequent enactments concerning estimations are given in the *Mishna Trakt. Erachin.*)

(5) By the *price of a dog*, Deut. xxiii. 18 (which was not to be brought into the sanctuary), the connection undoubtedly requires us to understand the pay obtained by unnatural practices, by the קָדֵשִׁים, ver. 17 (such vows occurring in heathendom). According to Josephus, *Ant.* iv. 8. 9, and elsewhere, the passage refers to the money paid, *ἐπ' ὀχεύσει κυνός*. See, in illustration of the passage, Spencer, *de leg. rit.* ii. 36, and Movers, *Phönicier*, i. p. 680.

(6) Lev. xxvii. 29: None devoted, which shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed, but shall surely be put to death.

(7) It was on account of this unconditional consignment to God's righteous punishment that anything devoted was called most holy.

(8) The expression צוּם does not occur till the later books.

(9) The passages cited are usually so interpreted as to make a vow of no force till *uttered by the lips*. Certainly, till this was the case, it could not come under legal control. In other respects, however, we are not justified in thus pressing the expression; and the view that a vow, *e.g.* like Hannah's, 1 Sam. i. 13, was not binding, would be quite opposed to the moral spirit of Mosaism.

(10) In the case of a widow or divorced woman, on the contrary, a vow was unconditionally binding. Servants were undoubtedly in like manner dependent, with respect to vows,

Digitized by Google

on the will of their masters (which is alone spoken of in Num. xxx. 11, according to Luther's mistaken translation). It is striking that the injunction, Num. xxx., says nothing of vows.

(11) To these simple appointments of the law, the Mishna added, in the treatise *Nedarim*, abundant casuistry, especially with respect to the forms in which the vow might be pronounced, and the degree in which the different forms were binding. See the article quoted, p. 789, where also the New Testament passages, Matt. xv. 5, Mark vii. 11, are considered. On the notorious *Kol Nidre*, see the article in Herzog's *Realencycl.* viii. p. 24 sq.

§ 135.

Nazaritism (1).

The most important vow, ἡ μεγάλη εὐχή, as Philo calls it (*de ebriet.* § 1), was that of Nazaritism. The name נָזִיר, from נזר, to separate (2), denotes this vow as one of abstinence (forswearing) (3). The Nazarite, however, is *one who separates himself* with a positive purpose of consecration to Jehovah (לְהַזִּיר לַיהוָה, Num. vi. 2, comp. ver. 5). The law of Nazaritism, Num. vi. 1–21, treats only of a *temporary* and evidently a *voluntary* assumption of this vow, and not of a perpetual Nazaritism like that announced of Samson, Samuel, and John the Baptist, and imposed on them from their births (4). It appoints that the Nazarite (or Nazaritess) shall, during the time of his separation, *in the first place*, renounce the use of *wine* and every other intoxicating drink (5), also of vinegar prepared from such drinks, and all solutions of grape juice, and even of all that proceeds from the vine, down to the kernels and husks; *secondly*, that he shall let his *hair* grow, so that no razor shall come upon his head; and *thirdly*, that he shall not make himself unclean by approaching a dead body, not even that of his father, mother, brother, or sister. For the rest, he was not commanded to withdraw from intercourse with his fellow-men, nor does the law of the Nazarite speak of an

Digitized by Google

obligation to celibacy; for which reason the Roman Catholic view, which sees in Nazaritism a type of monachism, is irrelevant. The usual and at the same time shortest duration of this vow of Nazaritism amounted, according to subsequent enactment (*Mishna Nasir*, i. 3, comp. Joseph. *bell. Jud.* ii. 15. 1), to thirty days (6). Of these three prohibitions, the two first appear, Judg. xiii. 4 sq., as binding on the perpetual Nazarite; in 1 Sam. i. 11 only the second, in Luke i. 15 only the first is mentioned (7). If a Nazarite, during the period of his consecration, became unclean by means of death occurring near him, he was, according to Num. vi. 9, to shave his head on the appointed day of his purification, viz. the seventh, comp. xix. 11 sq. (8). Then on the eighth day he was to bring two turtles or two young pigeons, one for a sin-offering, the other for a burnt-offering, for the priest to make an atonement for him. After this he was to hallow his head afresh, and without reckoning the former days, to begin a new period of consecration, by bringing a lamb of the first year for a trespass-offering. When the period of his vow had expired, the Nazarite was to offer a threefold sacrifice, viz. a male lamb of the first year for a burnt-offering, an ewe-lamb of the first year for a sin-offering, and a ram for a peace-offering; to these was to be added a basket of unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, and wafers anointed with oil, together with a meat and a drink offering. His hair was then shorn at the door of the sanctuary and cast into the fire of the peace-offering (9). Finally, the priest took the sodden shoulder of the ram, together with a cake and a wafer from the basket, put them upon the hands of the Nazarite, and waved them as a wave-offering before the Lord. These portions were allotted to the priest besides the wave-breast and heave-shoulder, which, as in all peace-offerings, were his due (10).

Nazaritism (an acquaintance with which is presupposed by Num. vi.) may perhaps rest upon some old national customs, but this cannot be definitely asserted. Its derivation by

Digitized by Google

Spencer (*de leg. hebr.* iii. 6. 1), J. D. Michaelis (*Entwurf der typischen Gottesgelahrtheit*, 2d ed. p. 52), and others, from Egypt, is founded on the myth of Osiris (Diodor. Sic. i. 18) (11), as is also the notice i. 83, according to which the Egyptians were accustomed to take upon themselves a similar vow during the maladies of their children. The custom, however, was not specifically Egyptian, the votive offering of the hair being found among other ancient nations, especially before the undertaking of a dangerous journey (12). Whatever may have been the origin of Nazaritism, its signification can only be ascertained from the Old Testament itself. And thus much is certain from Num. vi., that Nazaritism contemplated *a consecration of the whole being*. Of what character, then, was this consecration? According to Vilmar, the first and second requirements, the avoiding of wine—the culture of the vine being a symbol of civilisation—and the omission of cutting the hair, denote the separation of the Nazarite from that profane civilisation which endangers man's original relation to Jehovah. It is, however, far more likely, as Philo (comp. *de vict.* § 13) and Maimonides (*More Nebochim*, iii. 48) have already inferred, that they point to *the relation between the Nazarite vow and the commands imposed upon the priesthood* (13). The first requirement corresponds with the prohibition (Lev. x. 9 sq.) of the use of wine to priests during the time of their ministration, the third coincides exactly with the injunction to the high priest (Lev. xxi. 11) not to defile himself with the corpse of even his nearest relative. *The idea of the priestly life*, with its purity and remoteness from everything affected by death or corruption, its self-dedication to God, which sets aside even the nearest earthly ties, is the fundamental idea of Nazaritism. It is true that Nazaritism, as such, involved no special service of the sanctuary: the destination of her hoped-for son to such service by Samuel's mother was in addition to the Nazarite vow (14). Nazaritism, as already said, involved no priestly *service*, but only a voluntary appro-

Digitized by Google

priation of the idea of the priestly *mode of life*,—of what was imposed upon the priest in virtue of his hereditary vocation, viz. to regard himself as vowed to God, and consequently to renounce all that was opposed to this self-surrender. It must be granted that a special delight in prayer, and particularly in intercession, might arise, as Ewald conjectures (see *Gesch. des Volkes Israels*, ii. ed. 1, p. 404, ed. 2, p. 563), among persons thus vowed to God, from their deep and energetic belief that they were the Lord's special possession; but we cannot, with Schröring, appeal in support of this notion to Samuel, whose spirit of prayer is connected rather with his position and endowments as a prophet than with his perpetual Nazaritism. We next proceed to inquire into the meaning of the second requirement, viz. that of *letting the hair grow* (15). According to Num. vi., his hair formed the Nazarite's ornament of consecration, being, vers. 7, 9, the נֵזֶר of his God upon his head, and thus bearing the same name as the high priest's diadem, Ex. xxix. 6, and the anointing oil upon his head, Lev. xxi. 22 (16). The consecration of the Nazarite culminating in the free growth of the hair (hence the expression קָדַשׁ אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ, Num. vi. 11, comp. ver. 9), it is in this particular that we should expect to find the fullest impression of the import of Nazaritism. It does not accord with such an expectation to say, that the cutting of the hair being required by decorum, the letting it grow has only the negative meaning of professing to renounce the world and avoid all appearance of vanity and self-pleasing (17). Lev. xxv. 5, 11, where *the vines*, which grew unpruned and were not to be gathered during the sabbatical year and the year of jubilee, are called Nazarites, affords a clue to its true meaning. The consecration of the vine was effected by allowing its whole productive powers free scope to develope, and by withdrawing its products from profane use. In like manner was the hair of the Nazarite a symbol of *strength and vitality;* and the circumstance of its remaining inviolate during the whole period of his consecration, denoted that the person of the Nazarite was

Digitized by Google

God's possession, and his strength dedicated to His service, while its growth formed a sacred ornament, like the diadem by which the high priest was recognised as consecrated to God. Thus the command to let the hair grow forms the positive side to the command to avoid all contact with a dead body (comp. Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. p. 433). Even the heathen offerings of the hair arose from the notion that the hair is the symbol of vital power (the hair of the beard being the token of manhood) (18). In the case of Samson, the hair was not merely the symbol but also the vehicle of that abundance of strength by which he was fitted to become the deliverer of his fellow-countrymen (19). On the ceremony by which the Nazarite was released from his vow of consecration, we need only remark that of the three sacrifices enjoined, viz. the burnt-offering, which formed the foundation of the whole sacrificial act, the sin-offering, appointed for the atonement of any slight transgressions which might have occurred, and the peace-offering, the last was naturally the chief, as is manifest even by its requirement of an animal of higher grade. Two circumstances were peculiar to this offering,—first, that the Nazarite had to cast his shorn-off hair into the sacrificial fire, for, according to the meaning of the law, this and not the fire for boiling is certainly intended; and, secondly, that another portion of the sacrifice besides what was usual was to be waved. By the first act the Nazarite's ornament of consecration was withdrawn from all profanation, and surrendered as it were to Him in whose honour it had been worn, this being, as in the case of those portions of the sacrifice which might not be eaten, effected by its consumption in the sacrificial flame. By the second, it was intimated that the fellowship at table with the Lord which was involved in the peace-offering, took place on this occasion in an enhanced degree (20). From the significance of Nazaritism, as thus explained, it is easy to perceive why the raising up of Nazarites as well as prophets should be regarded, Amos ii. 11, as a special manifestation of Divine favour (21).

Digitized by Google

(1) Comp. my article *Nazaritism* in Herzog's *Realencycl.* x. p. 205 sq., and Ed. Vilmar's subsequent treatise, *Die symbolische Bedeutung des Naziräergelübdes, Stud. u. Kritik.* 1864, p. 438 sq.

(2) נזר, *Niph.* to separate from, to refrain from; *Hiph.* to separate out of, to withdraw, is akin to נדר, to vow, because a vowed gift is separated.

(3) As the Rabbis also explain נְזִירוּת by פרישה; see the passages in Carpzov, *app. ant. s. cod.* p. 151 sq. The explanation of the name, still retained by Saalschütz (*mos. Recht*, p. 158), "the crowned," viz. with thick hair, is incorrect; the other meaning also of "illustrious," under which נָזִיר occurs, Gen. xlix. 26, Deut. xxxiii. 16, Lam. iv. 7, is only so far connected with נֵזֶר, crown, as both significations arise from the farther notion of distinction which is combined with the primary import of נזר.

(4) Schröring, in his article *Samuel als Beter* (*Zeitschr. für luth. Theol.* 1856, p. 420 sq.), endeavours to show that Elijah was also a Nazarite. The proof which he adduces is, however, insufficient, בַּעַל שֵׂעָר most probably relating not to his long hair, but to his hairy prophetic mantle. Perpetual Nazarites were called נְזִירֵי עוֹלָם; others, on the contrary, נְזִירֵי יָמִים or נְזִירֵי זְמַן קָצוּב. It is worthy of remark that the mother of Samson was, according to Judg. xiii. 4, to refrain from wine and intoxicating drinks, and from unclean meats, during the period of pregnancy, and that the consecration of John the Baptist began also from his mother's womb (Luke i. 15). *Mishna Sota*, iii. 8, accords to the father only, and not to the mother, the right of devoting his son to Nazaritism before he had attained his thirteenth year, but it is not evident how this is to be harmonized with 1 Sam. i. 11.

(5) שֵׁכָר must undoubtedly be taken in this general sense; comp. Philo, *de victimis*, § 13.

(6) The Rabbinists found a reason for this in the numerical value of the word יהוה, Num. vi. 5.

(7) The subsequent enactment (*Mishna Nasir*, i. 2) distinguishes the Samson Nazarite from the ordinary נְזִיר עוֹלָם, who may shorten his hair when it becomes too burdensome, as Absalom, who has been regarded as a Nazarite, did, while this is not permitted to the Samson Nazarite. The latter, on the other hand,

Digitized by Google

is not bound to offer the legal offerings of purification in the case of uncleanness, because Samson brought none after he had contracted it (Judg. xiv. 8 sq., xv.).

(8) This hair of the unclean Nazarite was not to be burned, but buried. See *Mishna Themura*, vi. 4; comp. Maimonides *in loco*.

(9) Of course this is to be understood only of the removal of the extraordinary growth, not of making the head bald, which was a mark of disgrace. In the time of the Herodian temple, the cutting of the hair and the seething of the peace-offering took place in a particular space in the south-eastern corner of the court of the women.

(10) After the Nazarite was thus released from his vow, the use of wine was again permitted him. If he had made any other vows, he was to fulfil them simultaneously.

(11) On his journey to Ethiopia, Osiris vowed to let his hair grow till his return to Egypt.

(12) Compare *e.g.* the vow of Achilles in the *Iliad*, xxiii. 141 sq. On the other hand, Vatke's objection against the Egyptian origin of Nazaritism, viz. that the prohibition of wine must first have originated in Canaan as a land of vines, is quite untenable, the scriptural statements ascribing the cultivation of the vine to ancient Egypt being fully corroborated by ancient monuments. (See Hengstenberg, *die Bücher Mose's und Aegypten*, p. 12 sq.)

(13) On the connection of Num. vi. 6 sq. and Lev. xxi. 11, comp. *Mishna Nasir*, vii. 1, and the keen controversy discussed therein in the article quoted, p. 207, note.

(14) The words (1 Sam. i. 11), "I will give him to the Lord all the days of his life," relate, according to ver. 22 sq., to a perpetual service of the sanctuary. It cannot be shown that the women who served the sanctuary (Ex. xxxviii. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 22, comp. § 134) were Nazarites.

(15) One might feel inclined to find an analogy for this circumstance also in the enactments concerning the priestly mode of life, viz. in the command, Lev. xxi. 5, according to which the priest might make no baldness upon his head, nor cut off the corners of the beard,—a command directly opposed to the sacerdotal usages of Egypt. (Herodot. ii. 36: The priests of the gods everywhere else wear long hair, but in Egypt they shave

Digitized by Google

themselves.) As, on the other hand, however, the priest must not, at least according to Ezek. xliv. 20, have too long hair,—that very פֶּרַע which was required in the Nazarite,—no stress can be laid upon this analogy.

(16) Jer. vii. 29 also shows that the נֵזֶר is to be regarded as an ornament.

(17) Comp. Hengstenberg, *id.* p. 203, and Baur, *zu Am.* ii. 11. A similar view is that of R. Bechai (see Carpzov, *app.* p. 153), who regards the long hair of the Nazarite as a token of mourning (so also J. D. Michaelis, *id.* 127), and of Vilmar cited above. The cutting off of the hair of the cleansed leper, in consequence of which he was restored to intercourse with other men, cannot be brought forward in illustration of Num. vi. 18.

(18) On the offering up of the hair, *e.g.* by Athenian youths, see Plutarch, *Thes.* cap. 5; comp. the Troezene custom, Lucian, *de Dea Syra*, cap. 60.

(19) The sevenfold number of the locks of hair, Judg. xvi. 13, represents the hair of one vowed to God as a token of a covenant, as in the wider sense it really was. The very example of Samson shows, however, that this symbol is not to be regarded only (as by Bähr, *id.* p. 432) in an ethical sense as a figure of holiness, the bloom of life, though the ethic meaning of the entire surrender of vital energy to the service of God is directly connected with it. Baumgarten (*Kommentar zu Num.* vi. u. *die Apostelgeschichte, etc.*, ii. 1, p. 307) has brought forward another meaning. Comparing 1 Cor. xi. 3–16, he finds in long hair a token of subjection and subordination, which notion offers no natural explanation of the above data. Vitringa, on the other hand (*observ. sacr.* ed. 1723, i. p. 70), referring to Deut. xxxii. 42, Ps. lxviii. 22, views the long hair of tyrants as the *symbolum libertatis et naturæ indomitæ*, and then giving a spiritual turn to the figure, regards Nazaritism as the *symbolum status perfectæ libertatis filiorum Dei* (comp. his treatise, *typus Simsonis mystice expositus*, in the 6th Book of the *observ. sacr.* p. 507 sq.). The import of the act of sacrifice which was to take place in case of an infringement of the conditions of Nazaritism, is shown in the discussion of the sacrifice in question.

(20) As was the natural result of the priestly and sacred

Digitized by Google

fellowship with God, in which the Nazarite was placed by his vow (see Keil, *id.* p. 326).

(21) In our description of the period of the judges, we shall return once more to the subject of Nazaritism. In the later books of the Old Testament Nazaritism is never mentioned, though the *Rechabites*, who, according to Jer. xxxv. 8, also avoided the use of wine, may be regarded as a cognate phenomenon. The legality of the post-Babylonian age led also to a revival of Nazaritism. See on this subject, on those passages in Acts which are said to refer to a Nazarite vow on the part of St. Paul, and on certain modern decisions respecting it, the above-cited article, p. 209 sq.

APPENDIX: THE THEOCRATIC TRIBUTES.

§ 136.

The fundamental idea of the theocratic tributes is, that the people and all their possessions, especially the Holy Land, belonged to the Lord. The acknowledgment of this Divine title was to be made on the part of the people by the surrender to Jehovah of a portion of its produce, as a substitute for, and consecration of, the whole.

1. Hence *the (male) first-born, whether of man and beast*, were to be offered; the former were, however, to be redeemed (Ex. xiii. 13; Num. xviii. 15 sq.; see § 105). Of unclean animals, the first-born were to be redeemed at the valuation of the priest, with the addition of a fifth of the worth, xviii. 15, Lev. xxviii. 26 sq.; while of clean animals, on the contrary, the first-born, if without blemish, were to be sacrificed within a year from the eighth day after birth. Of this sacrifice, as of the peace-offering, the breast and right shoulder was allotted to the priest; the rest was used for a sacrifical repast (Num. xviii. 17 sq.; Deut. xii. 17 sq., xv. 19 sq.) (1). If the animal, however, had any blemish, the owner was to eat it at home (Deut. xv. 21 sq.).

Digitized by Google

2. The *first-fruits of all the produce of agriculture* (Ex. xxiii. 19; Num. xviii. 12 sq.; Deut. xxvi. 2 sq.), and, according to Deut. xviii. 4, of the fleece of the sheep, were also to be offered, the quantity being in the latter case left to the liberality of the offerer. The offering of the sheaf of first-ripe corn at the Passover, and of the loaves of first-fruits at Pentecost, by which gratitude for the newly-bestowed harvest was expressed, and the food of the new year hallowed, referred to the whole nation. Food in general, which had not been sanctified by the offering up of first-fruits, was unclean food for an Israelite (Hos. ix. 3) (2). How the Israelite was to praise God at this offering for having redeemed His people from Egypt, and given them possession of the Holy Land, may be seen especially in the beautiful ritual prescribed, Deut. xxvi. 1 sq., for the offering of the first-fruits.

3. As the first-fruits represent the blessing to be received, *the tenth* was, properly speaking, the fee which the Israelite had to render to Jehovah, as Lord of the soil, for the produce of the land. This tenth of the fruits, whether of field or tree, Lev. xxvii. 30–33, was assigned to the Levites, Num. xvii. 21–24, as a compensation for their deprivation of an inheritance among the tribes. Of this tenth the Levites were to deliver up a tenth, מְעַשֵּׂר מִן־הַמַּעֲשֵׂר (ver. 26), to the priests. It is only this tenth of the middle books of the Pentateuch which is to be strictly regarded in the light of tribute. The Deuteronomian tenth is of another character; for Deut. xvi. 22–27, comp. xii. 6 sq., enjoins that the tenth of corn, wine, and oil should be brought either in kind, or if the distance were too far, in money, to the sanctuary, and there used for a feast of rejoicing. Every third year, however, the tenth was to be left at home, and a great feast of tithes made, to which the Levites, strangers, widows, and orphans of the place were to be invited. It is this tenth of the third year that is referred to, Amos iv. 4 (3). That the tithe of the middle books and that of Deuteronomy existed contemporaneously, cannot be denied in the presence of

Digitized by Google

Jewish tradition, as existing even in LXX. of Deut. xxvi. 12; Tobit i. 7 sq.; Josephus, *Antiq.* iv. 8. § 8 and 22 (4). This latter tithe was, as above remarked, no tribute in the proper sense of the word, but, by the necessity it involved of laying by a certain portion of the income, a means of meeting the expense of the pilgrimages to the sanctuary, and of promoting the exercise of benevolence. That the rendering of these tithes had also the significance of a sacrifice of prayer, is shown by the prayer which, according to Deut. xxvi. 13 sq., was to be uttered after the tithing in the third year (5).

4. The *tribute* imposed for the *service of the sanctuary* (already mentioned § 92), Ex. xxx. 12 sq., according to which every Israelite when numbered was to furnish half a shekel (after the shekel of the sanctuary, and therefore of full weight) as a כֹּפֶר, lest any plague should fall upon the people at their numbering, falls under a different point of view from those hitherto mentioned. This sum was to be rendered as well by the poor as by the rich, showing that we have here to deal not with a property-tax, but a personal atonement, or more strictly covering, and hence this tribute falls rather under the category of atoning sacrifices. The money thus raised was, according to Ex. xxxviii. 25 sq., applied to the building of the sanctuary. This passage seems to represent it as paid but once, though the idea on which this law was founded was one which might at all times find its application; still it was by no means an annual impost. No mention is subsequently made of it till the restoration of the temple is spoken of after the fall of Athaliah, 2 Chron. xxiv. 6–11 (comp. 2 Kings xii. 5, and Keil *in loco*). In Neh. x. 33 we first meet with a yearly contribution of a third of a shekel for the service of the sanctuary, and that without reference to the Mosaic enactment. In the times of Christ the half shekel reappears (Matt. xvii. 24) as the general Jewish temple-tax.

(1) On the relation of the passages in Deuteronomy to those

Digitized by Google

in Numbers, see the article *Priesterthums* in Herzog's *Real-encyklop.* xii. p. 180 sq., and what is said by Riehm (*Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, p. 42 sq.) in opposing Hengstenberg, *Beiträge*, iii. p. 406 sq.

(2) Hos. ix. 3 regards the food of the people in captivity as unclean, because those offerings by which it would have been sanctified could not be made in a heathen land.

(3) In Amos iv. 4, the prophet, reproving the hypocritical piety of Israel, says: Bring your tithes every third year.

(4) The last-named passages reckon three tithes, the tithe of Deuteronomy being regarded as the second. That the command in Deuteronomy places this feast of tithes, which was to be held every third year, *in the place* of the yearly tithe, as Riehm (*Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, p. 45 sq.) supposes, is a groundless hypothesis. It could hardly, moreover, be conceived that the lawgiver, by ensuring to the Levites an opportunity of satisfying their appetite once in three years, could have thought he had thus alleviated their necessitous condition "as far as was possible." (Art. *Levi, Leviten, Levitenstädte.*)

(5) Deut. xxvi. 13: "I have brought away the hallowed things out of mine house, and also have given them unto the Levite, and unto the stranger, to the fatherless, and to the widow. . .; ver. 15: Look down then from Thy holy habitation, from heaven, and bless Thy people Israel, and the land which Thou hast given us, as Thou swarest unto our fathers, a land that floweth with milk and honey."

(*c*) THE ATONING SACRIFICE.

§ 137.

1st. The difference between the trespass-offering and the sin-offering with respect to the end in view.

The third and fourth kinds of sacrifice, the sin-offering (חַטָּאת) and the trespass-offering (אָשָׁם), have the common end of abolishing an interruption of the covenant relation caused by some transgression. This transgression is indeed designated

Digitized by Google

in both cases, with the exception of certain cases in the trespass-offering, as one committed in error, בִּשְׁגָגָה, *i.e.* in ignorance (see with respect to the sin-offering, Lev. iv. 2, 13, 22, 27; Num. xv. 27 sq.; to the trespass-offering, Lev. v. 15, 18). Undoubtedly this expression generally refers to *unintentional* offences (comp. in elucidation, Lev. iv. 13, v. 2 sq., 17, where וְלֹא יָדַע, "and he knew it not," relates not to ignorance of the command, but to unconsciousness and unpremeditatedness in the offence; see also how the בִּשְׁגָגָה of Num. xxxv. 11 is explained in Deut. iv. 42 by בִּבְלִי־דַעַת). Still the expression includes more than mere inadvertence, and extends to errors of infirmity, of rashness, we might say of levity. Its opposite is the sin בְּיָד רָמָה, "with an uplifted hand," *i.e.* rebelliously, Num. xv. 30, the sin committed defiantly, deliberately, the wilful transgression of the Divine commandments. For the latter there is from the legal standpoint no sacrifice, but "that soul shall be cut off from his people" (1).

What then is the distinction as to intention between the trespass and the sin offerings? This difficult question has been variously answered, but none of the answers hitherto given have been thoroughly applicable. It has been said, *e.g.*, that the sin-offering related to sins of commission, the trespass-offering to sins of omission; or that the sin-offering served to avert punishment, the trespass-offering to appease the conscience; or that the sin-offering concerned those sins which had come to the knowledge of others, the trespass-offering such as the transgressor was himself conscious of, without being convicted by others (2). An advance towards the solution of this question has been made chiefly by the treatises of Riehm (*über das Schuldopfer*, *Studien u. Krit.* 1854, i. p. 93 sq.) and Rinck (*über das Schuldopfer*, *id.* 1855, ii. p. 369 sq.), who were preceded by Kurtz, though his view had not exactly met the difficulty (3). This solution is facilitated when it is perceived that the section Lev. v. 1–13, which many moderns (*e.g.* Bähr and Hofmann) still refer to the trespass-offering, treats, on the contrary, of the sin-offering; even the

Digitized by Google

introductory formula (which is wanting ver. 1), "And the Lord spake unto Moses," ver. 14, showing that a new section begins here, and that 1–13 does not belong to what follows. The appearance of a reference to the trespass-offering in 1–13 disappears when it is perceived that the expressions אָשַׁם (to trespass) and אָשָׁם (trespass) must in this section be taken in their more general sense, in which also a trespass may be spoken of in the case of the sin-offering. On the other hand, it is clear, from vers. 6, 7 (where the juxtaposition of לְחַטָּאת and לְעֹלָה should be observed), 9, and 11 sq., that the חַטָּאת, the sin-offering, is spoken of, as is shown by the selection of sacrificial animals, ver. 6, and by the substitution of doves, ver. 7 sq., which was only allowed in the sin-offering, comp. xiv. 21 sq. (4). We now proceed to the three passages on the trespass-offering in which its import most clearly appears, viz. Lev. v. 14–16, to which belongs also vers. 17–19, Lev. vi. 1–6, and Num. v. 5–10. The *first* of these laws enacts that whoever has (בִּשְׁגָגָה) defrauded in holy things, *i.e.* things pertaining to the priestly revenues, shall bring a ram, according to the estimation of the priest, to the Lord, and at the same time make amends for his fraud by the addition of a fifth. A *more general* application to similar cases (for which the formula which had been used, iv. 27, of the sin-offering is chosen) (5) is then given to this *special* law, as Riehm rightly suggests (*id.* p. 99 sq.), by the addition, vers. 17–19, which has offered much difficulty from its similarity to iv. 17. The *second* commands that whoever has committed any breach of trust, has defrauded or in any way taken advantage of his neighbour, or appropriated that which he had found, and also denied such injury by oath, shall make amends by restoration, with the addition of a fifth, and shall also bring a ram, according to priestly estimation, for a trespass-offering. The cases in this category do not, as Riehm justly asserts (*idem*, p. 103 sq.), fall under the point of view of the שְׁגָגָה, as many have insisted, nor is the expression used here; their mild treatment is explained by the remark in the appendix

Digitized by Google

to § 113, vol. i. p. 373. The *third* passage expresses more briefly the command of the second, emphatically insists on confession, and finally enacts, also, that if the individual against whom the trespass was committed has no Goel, the compensation money shall, together with the ram to be offered, devolve to the Lord, *i.e.* be paid to the priest. What is *common to all three passages*, then, is as follows:—The trespass-offering presupposes a מַעַל, *i.e. an act of defrauding*, which, though chiefly an infraction of a neighbour's rights in the matter of property, is also, according to the views of Mosaism, an *infraction of God's rights* in respect of law. Hence, besides material reparation, increased by a fifth of the value, for the offence which is called in Num. v. 7 הֵשִׁיב אֶת־אָשְׁמוֹ, the transgressor had also to make satisfaction to God by means of the trespass-offering. That satisfaction on the part of man is the essential element in the notion of the אָשָׁם, is shown especially by 1 Sam. vi. 3 sq. (6). From this point of view the other cases in which a trespass-offering was to be brought are to be explained, *e.g.* the law Lev. xix. 20–22, unchastity with the slave of another being an infraction of the right of property (7). The trespass-offerings, too, which were prescribed for the cleansing of the *leper*, Lev. xiv. 11 sq., and the *Nazarite* whose vow had been broken, Num. vi. 12, may be understood from the point of view described. It is evident that in both cases the trespass-offering effects a *restitutio in integrum*, a restoration to the privileges of the theocratic citizen. But how, we may ask, is this effected? According to Riehm, who seems to have the right idea, the trespass-offering is here also to be regarded as a kind of *mulcta*, a restitutionary payment for an infraction of law. The leper, so long as he was excluded from the congregation, did not offer to God the reverence that was due to Him,—he, as it were, diminished it. The Nazarite, by the intermission of his vow, deprived God of the time dedicated to Him, and delayed for so much longer the payment of his vow (8). Keil, on the other hand, after Rinck's example (*idem*, p. 374), regards the

Digitized by Google

trespass-offerings of the leper and the Nazarite in the light of a *compensation* for *restoration* to the former state of consecration, thus giving them also the significance of a sacrifice of prayer (an extension of the trespass-offering of which there is no other example) (9). Satisfaction being thus rendered in the trespass-offering for a committed מַעַל, it served indeed at the same time as an atonement (כִּפֶּר) for him who had committed the מַעַל (Lev. v. 18), so that, covered by this satisfaction, he might approach the holy God. But to effect *directly* an atonement for a sinner's *soul* (by the offering of a pure life), and therefore the *absolution from sin of the sinner's person*, was the office not of the trespass but of the *sin offering*. This was offered for all sins committed, בִּשְׁגָגָה, and indeed not merely for separate offences, but for all sins unknown and unatoned for during a certain period. The reason that sin-offerings were combined with lustrations for uncleanness, is found in the fact that sexual conditions, the disease of leprosy, and death, were regarded in their connection with the natural sinfulness of man (comp. § 77). Now, every sin involves also an אָשָׁם, a debt (comp. Lev. iv. 3, 13, 22, etc.); but every debt is not a defrauding in the stricter sense, an infringement, properly speaking, of the Divine rights, though it must certainly be conceded that the limits cannot always be clearly defined. Where such a מַעַל does not take place, the expiation of the person effected by the sin-offering annuls also the אָשָׁם without any farther offering. From what has been said, it is also easy to understand why the trespass-offerings always refer to certain concrete cases, and never, like the sin-offerings, to the offences in general committed during whole periods, and do not appear, like other kinds of offerings, on festal occasions (comp. Num. vii. 28 sq.).

(1) Another feature common to both the sin and trespass offering was the confession of sin connected with them, Lev. v. 5, xvi. 21; Num. v. 7. (Article *Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament.*)

Digitized by Google

(2) This, which was formerly the most widely accepted view, is alluded to by Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 9. 3, and has been defended among moderns, especially by Winer (*Reallex.* ii. 3d edit. p. 432 sq.). This distinction receives no adequate support from Lev. iv. 23, 28, where הוֹדַע does not necessarily imply an objective conviction (comp. יָדַע, v. 3 sq.); it also leaves several cases of the trespass-offering unexplained, as that of the leper and the Nazarite, and that prescribed xix. 20 sqq.; comp. also Ezra x. 9, where a public conviction took place. Ewald's view, that the trespass-offering was the penitential offering of "one who felt himself excluded from the congregation by some transgression which depressed him, or by some secret Divine infliction," and that the sin-offering was presented when the fault was first remarked by others, is akin to this (*Alterthümer*, § iii. p. 77 sq.). See the enumeration of other views in Knobel on Lev. v. 14 sq.

(3) The fact that Ewald, even in his latest edition, ignores the existence of these treatises, is only a proof of his unwillingness to learn from others.

(4) The most recent expositors, including both Keil and Knobel, have decided on this exposition of the paragraph.

(5) Knobel refers Lev. v. 17–19 to infractions of the rights of individual Israelites, who here, as in ch. iv., are said to come after the priests; to injuries of neighbours like those mentioned xix. 11 sqq., Ex. xx. 17, etc. The passage must, however, be understood as referring also in a more general way to any מַעַל unwittingly committed.

(6) In 1 Sam. vi. 3 sq., the expression הֲשִׁיב אָשָׁם is used of the gifts which the Philistines offer as an expiation for their detention of the ark.

(7) According to Lev. xix. 20–22, any who should lie with the bondmaid of another, besides undergoing a civil penalty (בִּקֹּרֶת, probably corporal punishment), was also to offer a ram, of which, moreover, no estimation was prescribed, to the Lord as an atonement for his fault. The omission of the estimation may be explained by the consideration that there was here, generally speaking, no מַעַל that could be estimated by money. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1, ed. 1, p. 172, ed. 2, p. 260, takes quite a different view of the passage.

(8) Comp. Riehm, *idem*, p. 101 sq. Keil (*Archäol.* i. p.

Digitized by Google

221) objects that the leper was not guilty of this exclusion from the public worship of God, and likewise that the Nazarite who, during the period of his consecration, had unwittingly contracted ceremonial uncleanness, had violated no right. But he here ignores the significance of leprosy and uncleanness in the eye of the law. If both involved the necessity of a sin-offering, the infraction thereby committed upon the sphere of Divine rights might also be regarded as a matter for which compensation should be made.

(9) With respect, finally, to the trespass-offering, which, at Ezra's instigation (Ezra x. 18 sq.), those were to bring who had married strange wives, we find that here also a מַעַל was in question (comp. vers. 2 and 10): the desecration of the covenant people by heathen blood (comp. ix. 2) was an act of injustice and fraud towards the covenant God which demanded compensation.

§ 138.

2. *The Ritual and Import of the Trespass and the Sin Offerings: The Trespass-Offering.*

There is a decided difference in the ritual of these two offerings, corresponding to their different intentions. Only the male sheep, generally the full-grown (according to the *Mishna Sebachim*, x. 5, two-year old) ram, the very animal not included among the sin-offering victims, was used for the trespass-offering; hence the technical expression אֵיל הָאָשָׁם. In the case alone of the trespass-offerings of the leper and the Nazarite was the less costly animal—the male (according to Num. vi. 12, and LXX. Lev. xiv. 10, one-year old) lamb (כֶּבֶשׂ)—prescribed, undoubtedly to point out the inferior degree of the אָשָׁם. Why the *male* sheep was selected for the trespass-offering cannot be exactly determined. Riehm (*id.* p. 117) thinks that it was because an infraction of law exhibited a feature of turbulence. It was, however, general in ancient times to use rams and other male animals for fines (comp. Knobel on Lev. v. 15). Another essential distinction between the trespass and the sin

Digitized by Google

offering was, that the victims were in the former case always the same, whatever might be the position of the offerer in the theocracy; nor could a substitute be admitted, as in the sin-offering, on account of the poverty of the worshipper. This makes it clear that the chief object of the trespass-offering was not an expiation for the *person* as such, but a compensation for a strictly-defined injury. The circumstance, also, that a certain margin was, in Lev. v. 15, left in the *estimation* of the ram (by the demand of an indefinite number of shekels, two or more), shows that the value of the ram was to bear a certain proportion to the greatness of the מַעַל (1).—The proceedings at the bringing of the trespass-offering are laid down Lev. vii. 1–7. The laying on of the hand is not specially mentioned in this passage, on which account Rinck (*id.* p. 375 sq.) and Knobel (*in loco*) suppose that it did not take place, which the latter explains by the consideration that it is not a surrender, a free-will offering, but an imposed penance which is here in question. It cannot, however, be proved that the act of laying the hand on the head of the victim expressed a voluntary surrender; and the non-mention of this act in the passage quoted may, as in the corresponding passage on the sin-offering, vi. 17–23, be accidental. The trespass as well as the burnt-offering and the sin-offering was slain at the north side of the altar. There is no kind of hint that its slaughter signified the substitutionary suffering of death by the ram for the transgressor; as even Keil (*Archäologie*, i. p. 237) here supposes, the most striking case would have been the trespass-offering of the Nazarite. The symbolical equivalent for the trespass was the ram as estimated by the priest. The blood was, as in the burnt-offering and peace-offering, only sprinkled about the altar (2), the same portions of fat as in the peace-offering and sin-offering being burnt upon the altar. The rest of the flesh was treated as in sin-offerings of the lower grade, that is to say, it was to be consumed by the priests (only by males) in the holy place. For it is self-evident that he who was offering it could not himself be

Digitized by Google

allowed any participation of the compensation he was rendering for an offence committed (3).

(1) Comp. Riehm, *id.* p. 119. The words, Lev. v. 15, בְּעֶרְכְּךָ כֶּסֶף שְׁקָלִים, according to thy estimation, a sum of shekels, are understood by the older authorities of an estimation amounting to *two* shekels.

(2) Thus even in the particular in which especially the peculiarity of the sin-offerings appears, viz. the manipulation of the blood, the trespass-offering stands on a level with the other kinds of sacrifices.

(3) The significance of the several elements of the act of sacrifice has already been discussed. The consumption of the flesh by the priests will be further treated of when we come to the sin-offering.

§ 139.

Continuation: The Ritual of the Sin-Offering (1).

Peculiar to the sin-offering are—

1. The difference of the victims, according to the theocratic position of him for whom they were sacrificed. The victim was *a young bullock* in sin-offerings of the highest grade, viz. those for the high priest on the Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 3, or when he had transgressed in his office of representative of the people (Lev. iv. 3, "to the offence of the people"), or when the whole congregation had transgressed, iv. 13; or, finally, the sin-offerings pertaining to the consecration of priests and Levites (Ex. xxix. 10, 14, 36; Num. viii. 8). A kid of the goats (עִזִּים שְׂעִיר) was the sin-offering for the people on the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 5), on the other yearly festivals, and at the New Moon (Num. xxviii. 15, 22, 30, xxix. 5, etc.); for the offence of a ruler (נָשִׂיא, Lev. iv. 22 sq.); at the dedication of the tabernacle (ix. 3, 15, comp. Num. vii. 16, etc.); and again for the offences of the congregation (Num. xv. 24), viz. when something had been committed "away from the eyes," *i.e.* behind

Digitized by Google

the back of the congregation (2). A *goat* or a *female* lamb was to be offered for the offence of an ordinary Israelite (Lev. iv. 28, 32, v. 6); a ewe-lamb of the first year was the sin-offering at the release from the Nazarite's vow (Num. vi. 14), and at the purification of the leper (Lev. xiv. 10, 19). *Turtle doves* and *young pigeons* formed the sin-offerings at purifications (Lev. xii. 6, xv. 14, 29; Num. vi. 10), and were the substitutes for a head of small cattle from the poor who were unable to afford the latter (Lev. v. 7, xiv. 22). If any were not able to offer even pigeons, a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, but without oil or frankincense, might be substituted in the case of ordinary offences (v. 11) (3).

2. The bringing of the blood to more sacred places than was the case in other sacrifices, and that in the three following degrees: *a.* In sin-offerings of goats, kids, or lambs, for individual Israelites (with the exception of the high priest), some of the blood was smeared on the horns of the altar, and the rest poured out at its base (Lev. iv. 25, 30, 34). The same was done at the sin-offering of a bullock at the consecration of priests, Ex. xxix. 12, and undoubtedly at that of Levites also. *b.* In the sin-offerings of bullocks offered for the congregation or for the high priest on other occasions than the Day of Atonement, the blood was sprinkled seven times toward the inner veil, the horns of the altar of incense were smeared therewith, and the rest was poured out at the base of the altar of burnt-offering (Lev. iv. 5 sqq., 16 sqq.). *c.* At the greatest of the sin-offerings, viz. that on the Day of Atonement, the blood was taken into the Holy of Holies (see thereon § 140).

3. The consumption in sin-offerings of the lower grade (excepting those made at the consecration of priests) of the *flesh of the sacrifice*, which had come into close contact with God, and was therefore designated as *most holy* (Lev. vi. 22, קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, comp. Knobel on Lev. xxi. 22), by the priests in the fore-court of the sanctuary, vi. 18 sq. In sin-offerings of the higher grade, and those made at the consecration of priests, the flesh,

Digitized by Google

together with the skin, head, bones, entrails, and dung were burned in a clean place outside the camp (Lev. iv. 11 sq., 21, vi. 23, xvi. 27) (4). Whoever had his garment sprinkled with the blood of the sin-offering, was to wash it out in the holy place, evidently to guard against a profanation of the sacred blood. The vessels in which the sin-offerings of the lower grade had been boiled were, if of earth, to be broken; if of brass or copper, to be scoured with the greatest care (vi. 20 sq.). In offerings of the higher grade, he who had burnt the flesh without the camp was to bathe and wash his clothes before his return to the camp (xvi. 28) (5).

The explanation of the ritual of the sin-offering must be connected with what has already been said on the nature of sacrificial atonement. To substitute for the impure soul of the sinner a pure life, which, being offered to God, may cover the offerer, is, as remarked, § 127, the meaning of a bloody offering, and consequently the direct intention of the sin-offering. The representation of the offerer's *person* being the matter in question, the value of the victim corresponds with the difference of his theocratic position. The reason for the predominance of goats (especially the he-goat) in the sin-offering may be that their flesh was considered less delicate (6); for the consumption of the flesh by the priests in some of the sin-offerings is not to be regarded as a formal repast. With this corresponds the omission of the oil in the substitutionary flour-offering of the poor. Applying, then, our former propositions, we find that the significance of the several elements of the sin-offering is as follows: The *laying on of the hand*, with which was probably connected the confession of sin, is meant to express the intention of the offerer to sacrifice the pure life of the animal as a covering for his impure soul. The sacrifice itself follows in the blood obtained by the slaughter, and then immediately applied to the holy place, where God is present. And to show that this offering of the blood in the sin-offering is not the presupposition, but the main point of the sacrificial act, the blood is here

Digitized by Google

actually placed upon the altar; may, to bring it, as it were, as near as possible to God, it is even applied to the horns of the altar (comp. § 117) (7). This bringing near of the blood to God advances in sin-offerings of the higher grade, till it reaches its climax in the great annual Atonement, the blood of which attains the nearest approach, by being brought into the Holy of Holies (8). The offering of the blood is followed by *the burning of the fatty portions* upon the altar, and that, as is distinctly said, Lev. iv. 31, לְרֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה,—an addition which must not be overlooked (9), as showing that the burning of the fat in the sin-offering cannot have an essentially different meaning from that which it bears in the peace-offering (10). God commands that the fat also of the pure victim, whose blood He has accepted as a covering for the soul of the sinner, should be conveyed to Him by means of fire, and this gives it the significance of a propitiatory offering, the acceptance of which serves as a sanction to the preceding act of atonement (11). Only the fat, however, and not the whole animal, was presented on the altar, to give prominence to the idea that in this sacrifice the offering of a gift holds a secondary position to the act of expiation. The rest of the flesh, moreover, was not to be used in a manner by which this *sanctissimum* could be in any way profaned. It is self-evident that they by whom the sin-offering was brought could not be permitted any use of it. Hence, in sin-offerings of the higher grade, in which the priests themselves were included among those for whom atonement was made, all that remained to be done was to *destroy* the flesh in a clean manner; for this is the meaning of the burning, as even the expression chosen, שָׂרַף (in distinction from הִקְטִיר, comp. § 128), shows. But why, it may be asked, was the flesh of sin-offerings of the lower grade, as well as that of the peace-offerings, to be consumed by the priests in their official capacity in the holy place? The answer is furnished by Lev. x. 17, though not indeed in the sense in which the passage has been usually interpreted. When it is

Digitized by Google

said in this very variously understood passage, that the sin-offering is given to the priests to eat, "to take away the guilt of the congregation, and to atone for them before the Lord,"—the actual taking away of guilt and atonement being the result of the offering of the blood,—the expression must be taken (as by Vatablus) as declaratory. The eating of the flesh by the priests involves, like the burning of the fat, an acceptance on the part of God, which serves to declare and confirm the fact that the sacrifice has actually attained its end of making an atonement. So far Philo (*de vict.* § 13) really sees correctly, when he points out as one of the reasons for this use of the flesh of the sin-offering, the quieting of the offerer's mind by the assurance of forgiveness; for God would not have bidden His servants to partake of such a meal, unless a full oblivion of sin had taken place (12).

Very differently is the ritual of the sin-offering explained, when its essential feature is made to consist in the infliction of a *pœna vicaria*. Not to repeat what has already been said on this point (§ 126 sq.), we will confine ourselves to the following remarks. According to this theory, the animal is said to be, by the laying on of the hand, laden with sin, and thus to have become "incarnate sin" (in the antitype, 2 Cor. v. 21: God "made Christ to be sin"), the impurity of the sinner being transferred to the victim, and, as it were, imbibed by it. Thus the Rabbinists (13), and among moderns, *e.g.* Hengstenberg (*Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1852, p. 117 sq.). In this case the sprinkling of blood which follows is not the real act of atonement; on the contrary, its intention is (comp. Hengstenberg, p. 122) the *exhibition* of the atonement effected by the death of the victim, and of its acceptance on the part of God. While, then, Kurtz, *e.g.* as already cited, § 127, views the victim as restored *in integrum* by death,—which makes it explicable why the burnt fat of this sin-offering is a sweet savour to God,—others, on the contrary (14), regard sin as still cleaving to the flesh of the victim, and the act of atonement as completed when the priests

Digitized by Google

eat the sin-offering, and thus having, as it were, incorporated the sin, annul it by their official holiness. This view has been chiefly vindicated by the name of the sin-offering, חַטָּאת. This word, however, as well as פֶּשַׁע, which stands in juxtaposition with it, Mic. vi. 7, denotes by an obvious metonomy that which is offered *for* sin. The expression is given more in full, Lev. iv. 3; עַל־חַטָּאת, and חַטָּאת also, when it stands for the sin-offering, is correctly rendered in the LXX. by *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*. The obvious objection, that the body of the victim thus infected with sin is not, like the corpse of an executed malefactor, cast as soon as possible as a קְלֻלַת אֱלֹהִים (Deut. xxi. 23) into an unclean place, may be removed by the remark (15) that there is a distinction between inherent and imputed sin, and that with the latter the victim may nevertheless in another aspect be regarded as most holy, for which twofold significance of the victim the ceremony Num. xix. 7–10, hereafter to be discussed, may with some plausibility be appealed to.

(1) The ordinary sin-offering is here chiefly treated of, and a more circumstantial description of the great act of expiation on the Day of Atonement subsequently given.

(2) The precept Num. xv. 24 is distinguished from that given Lev. iv. 13 sqq., by the circumstance that the latter has regard to the case of a transgression in which the whole congregation shares, the former to a case in which the congregation as such is not the agent, but has to appear for the sin of one of its members, committed probably without its knowledge.

(3) For it had not the character of the Minchah, properly so called, from which it is also distinguished by the בְּמִנְחָה of Lev. xv. 13.

(4) According to Lev. iv. 12, to the place where the ashes of the sacrifice were brought from the place mentioned, i. 16.

(5) When pigeons formed the sin-offering, it cannot be certainly distinguished whether, after removing and casting on the ashes, the crop, and entrails, the whole bird was burnt upon the altar, or as stated, *Mishna Sebachim*, vi. 4, the blood only appertained to the altar, the rest to the priest. From the flour-offering of the poor the priest was to take a handful to burn

Digitized by Google

on the altar, the rest; as in the case of the meat-offering, becoming his own (Lev. v. 12 sq.).

(6) The rabbinical notions, that the propitiation for the people on the Day of Atonement must necessarily have been a goat, because the patriarchs slew a goat when Joseph was sold, or (as Maimonides supposes) because the Israelites had most grievously transgressed in the worship of the goat (Lev. xvii. 7), and the like, are scarcely worthy of mention. The idea, too, of Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii. p. 399), that the goat, on account of its long shaggy hair, is designed to allude to sorrow for sin, must be too artificial.

(7) Keil, by viewing the horns as a symbol of power, understands this otherwise. In his view, the soul is symbolically transferred to the full sway of the power of Divine grace, by the putting of the blood on the horns of the altar.

(8) The sevenfold sprinkling which took place in the latter sacrifices, signifies that the entire covenant relationship with God was compromised by sin, and must be re-established by expiation.

(9) In respect to which only an incorrect interpretation of the sin-offering could allow us to say, with Knobel, that it escaped the author by an oversight.

(10) It is true, indeed, that it is not said of the sin-offering, as it is of both the burnt-offering and the peace-offering, that it is *acceptable* to Jehovah (וְנִרְצָה לוֹ, Lev. i. 4, vii. 18, xix. 7, xxii. 19, 23, etc.), for the bringing of a sin-offering is ever a *sad* necessity.

(11) In the other kinds of sacrifices, the preceding expiation by blood forms the *conditio sine qua non* of that which is their main point, namely, the offering of a gift (comp. § 127, conclusion): in the sin-offering, on the contrary, the subsequent gift serves for a confirmation, and so in a certain sense for a completion, of the expiation, which is the immediate intention of this sacrifice.

(12) A still farther declaration of the forgiveness of sins is added, as in the ritual of the Day of Atonement (see § 140).

(13) See the passages in Outram, *de sacrificiis*, p. 251 sq.

(14) Thus after the precedent of Deyling, *observ.* i. No. lxv. 2, Hengstenberg, *id.* p. 118, Keil, *id.* p. 232; comp. also Ewald's *Alterthümer*, ed. 1, p. 70, ed. 3, p. 88.

(15) See Hengstenberg, *id.*; comp. Keil, *id.* p. 235.

Digitized by Google

§ 140.

Continuation: The Ritual of the Day of Atonement (1).

The supreme act of expiation was, as already remarked, that which took place on the tenth day of the seventh month (*Tisri*), the annual *Day of Atonement*, יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים, in the Talmud יוֹמָא, *i.e.* simply the day (2). Fasting being commanded, on pain of extirpation, from the evening of the ninth till the evening of the tenth (3), it is called in Josephus (*Ant.* xiv. 4. 3) ἡ τῆς νηστείας ἡμέρα, in Philo (*de septen.* ii. p. 296) ἡ νηστείας ἑορτή, and in Acts xxvii. 9, briefly ἡ νηστεία (4). To it refer the laws Lev. xvi. 23, 26–32, and Num. xxix. 7–11. On this day an atonement was effected, not merely for the people and the priesthood, but in connection therewith for the sanctuary also, "that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness," Lev. xvi. 16, and was consequently always undergoing defilement through the sins of the people. This atonement related, moreover, to *all* the sins of the people, and therefore to those also which had been already expiated by other acts. Bleek (*Kommentar zu* Heb. v. 2), Keil (*Archäologie*, i. p. 404, and *Kommentar zu* Lev. xvi.), and others are not in accordance with Lev. xvi. 16, 21, 30, 34, when they limit the atonement of this day solely to those sins and uncleannesses which, in spite of the strictest observance of the laws of sacrifice and purification, still remained unexpiated (5). This deficiency would indeed have been repaired by the sin-offering to be brought at every new moon (Num. xxviii. 15). The act of atonement performed on the Day of Atonement, on the contrary, completed the expiatory sacrifices of the past year in another manner. It was founded, as Kurtz (*Opferkultus*, p. 335) correctly observes, on the assumption that the atonement which the fore-court offered was insufficient,—that the atoning blood must be brought for acceptance as near to God as possible, even to the place of His dwelling. With respect, too, to the nature of the sins, the above passages

Digitized by Google

seem to set no limit to the atonement. For while the usual sin-offerings relate, according to Lev. iv. 2, etc., to sins committed "in error" (see § 137), the law of the Day of Atonement makes use of the most general expressions (עָוֹן and פֶּשַׁע, as well as חַטָּאת) concerning the sins to be atoned for on this day, and evidently seeks, by accumulating them (so especially Lev. xvi. 21, "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins"), to express the universality of the atonement. Consistently with this, Jewish tradition also refers the expiation of the Day of Atonement to every kind of sin. The limitation really existing results from the connection with other laws (6). This gives an absolute denial to the notion that the atonement of this day would ensure impunity to any individuals who had by transgression incurred punishment. It even assumes as self-evident that all sinning, בְּיָד רָמָה, in the course of the year had been visited with the vengeance due thereto, by the extermination of the offender. Consequently the act of expiation availed for the congregation as a whole (see ver. 33, כָּל־עַם הַקָּהָל). To this congregation, seeking God's presence with repentance, pardon for the transgressions committed in its midst during the course of the year is promised. Their state of grace is renewed to the people of God; while by the simultaneous atonement for the priesthood and sanctuary, the continuance of a legal representation before God, without which they could not exist as His people, and of God's presence in their midst, is assured to them (7). The act of atonement to be effected is, as already pointed out, divided *into two acts*,—first, the atonement for the high priest and his house, whereby, as is obvious from ver. 33, the priesthood, which is subsequently, Ps. cxv. 10, cxviii. 3, cxxxv. 19, called the house of Aaron, is to be understood, and then for the congregation. The atonement for the high priest must take place first, because the mediator capable of effecting an atonement for the people of God must first be prepared. The atonement for the sanctuary is connected with both acts (8).

Digitized by Google

The *ritual* of the day is, according to Lev. xvi., as follows: The high priest, who, according to subsequent injunction, had removed a week before from his own dwelling to a chamber in the sanctuary, was, as a preparation for his functions, to bathe his whole body (ver. 4) (9),—not, as in ordinary ministrations, to wash merely his hands and feet,—and then to put on the garments specially appointed for the act of expiation to be on this day effected. These, which were composed entirely of white linen (בַּד), consisted of coat, breeches, girdle, and mitre (מִצְנֶפֶת). In this clothing, the absence of ornament, by which it was distinguished from the official vestments of the high priest on other occasions, is undoubtedly to be considered (10); still its special significance is to be an expression of the *highest degree of purity*, for which reason its assumption is immediately connected, ver. 4, with the bathing (11).

The high priest was then to bring the bullock which he was to offer, of course from his own resources (*ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀναλωμάτων*, Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 10. 3), as a sin-offering for himself and his house, and the two kids which were the sin-offering for the congregation. Upon the latter he was to cast lots, according to which one was destined to be sacrificed to the Lord, the other to be sent away into the wilderness, לַעֲזָאזֵל. With regard to the latter word, we wholly reject the view which regards it as a compound of עֵז (which does not mean a he-goat, but a she-goat) and אָזַל, going away, and consequently as a designation of the goat (Vulgate, *caper emissarius*; Luther and others, freed-goat; A.V. scape-goat; this, apart from the unusual composition, gives in vers. 10 and 26 the very harsh construction, "in the capacity of freed-goat") (12). The word is to be explained as a Pealpal form of עזל, *removit*, akin to אָזַל, to go forth, contracted from עֲזָלְזֵל. It may be taken as a *nomen abstractum* in the sense of "dismissal": "for complete dismissal" (so Tholuck and Bähr), but is probably the name of the evil spirit whose abode is in the wilderness (so most interpreters), and who is thus designated

Digitized by Google

as him who is sent away, or, as Ewald says, as the Daemon, who is sent to a distance. Such is perhaps also the meaning of the LXX., where the word is translated in vers. 8 and 10 by *ἀποπομπαῖος* (13). The high priest having then slain the bullock, was (while a priest, as tradition reports, stirred the blood to prevent its coagulation) to take a censer full of burning coals from the altar before the Lord, *i.e.* the altar of burnt-offering (14), and two handfuls of beaten incense, and to bring it within the veil, *i.e.* into the holy of holies (without looking about him, according to tradition). "And he shall put the incense," it is further said, "upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not" (15). The ascending cloud of incense, symbolical of prayer ascending to God, was to interpose as a protection between the high priest and the presence, albeit concealed, of God. The high priest probably left the censer before the ark till he went out for the last time, that the smoke might be still further dispersed, and fill the Holy of Holies. He now approached the altar of burnt-offering, retiring, as tradition tells us, backwards from the holy place, to fetch the blood of the bullock and to begin the act of atonement properly so called. Entering the Holy of Holies with the blood, he sprinkled it with his finger once "towards the mercy-seat frontwards," *i.e.* on its front side, and then seven times "before the mercy-seat," *i.e.* upon the ground before the ark (16), leaving, as may be presumed, the vessel containing the blood in the holy place for the next act of sprinkling Having thus made atonement for himself, he was now capable. of making it for the congregation. He therefore returned to the court, slew the goat destined for the Lord, brought its blood also into the Holy of Holies, and performed the same sprinklings as before. This concluded the acts of atonement made in the *Holy of Holies*, which were followed by that made in the *Holy place;* for it is this that is signified by אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, ver. 16*b*, comp. with vers. 20, 23, 33, in distinction from

Digitized by Google

קֹדֶשׁ, which here stands for the Holy of Holies. Of this act it is briefly said, "So shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation that dwelleth among you." This is to be completed by the injunction of Ex. xxx. 10, which commands that an atonement was to be made once a year upon the horns of the altar of incense with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement. Hence it may be assumed that a single application of the blood to the horns of the altar of incense, followed by a sevenfold sprinkling in front of it, corresponding with the process within the Holy of Holies, took place. It is, however, uncertain whether this was done first with the blood of the bullock and then with that of the goat, or whether, as tradition (M. Joma, v. 4; Maimonides, iii. 5) states, and as is more probable, the blood of both victims was mingled for the purification of the holy place. It is further remarked (Lev. xvi. 17) that during these acts of atonement by the high priest, no one besides himself might be present in the tabernacle, lest the presence of another should again render the sanctuary unclean. Lastly followed the atonement for the altar of burnt-offering, which here, as well as in ver. 12, is called the altar that is before the Lord (17).

The atonement for the priesthood, the congregation, and the sanctuary, according to its three divisions, being thus completed, the other goat (ver. 20, comp. with ver. 10), on which the lot for Azazel fell, was to be brought hither, *i.e.* before the altar of burnt-offering, and presented alive before the Lord, and indeed, as is added in ver. 10, לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו, which controverted words (18) probably stand for "to cover him" (the goat), viz. by the application of the blood of the slaughtered goat (19). The proceedings at the purification of the recovered leper, Lev. xiv. 6, and the infected house, ver. 51, elucidate this point. Here two birds were taken: the one was killed; and the other, after being dipped in the blood of the first, was let loose into the open field. As the slain goat represented the people for whom atonement was to be made, so was the living goat (on which see § 141) the instrument of

Digitized by Google

the people, when, an atonement having been made, they had become partakers of Divine forgiveness. "This duality of the goats is caused only (as Hengstenberg, *Die Bücher Mose's und Aegypten*, p. 171, rightly remarks) by the physical impossibility of representing the two elements to be represented by a single example." By the application of the blood of the first goat to the second, it was moreover declared, that only in virtue of the atonement effected by the blood of the first goat are the people placed in a condition to send away their sins as forgiven to Azazel (20). The act of sending away the goat is thus described (Lev. xvi. 21 sq.): "And let Aaron lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat (21), and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions according to all their sins, and let him put them upon the head of the goat, and send him away by a man ready at hand into the wilderness. And let the goat bear upon him all their iniquities into a separated land" (אֶרֶץ גְּזֵרָה), *i.e.* a place whence no road leads back to the dwellings of the people (so that there need be no anxiety lest the goat should find his way back to their abodes). Thus were the sins laid upon the goat to be, as it were, banished to a place removed from all contact with the people. That the goat was to perish in the wilderness, and thus to suffer what is due to the sinner, upon whom his sin remains, is by no means hinted in the text. It is true, indeed, that the high priest, according to a subsequent enactment, invoked upon the goat the punishment due to all the transgressions of Israel, and that tradition further declares (M. Joma, vi. 6) that the goat was cast down from a rock and destroyed by the fall. The law, however, would never have been silent concerning so essential a feature. He who had led away the goat for Azazel was (ver. 26) to wash his clothes, and to bathe, and afterwards to come into the camp.

After the goat was sent into the wilderness (22), the high priest betook himself to the (ver. 23) tabernacle, took off the linen garments, and deposited them there (23), then bathed

Digitized by Google

again in the court, put on his usual official garments, and offered the burnt-offerings, consisting of the rams mentioned vers. 3 and 5, for himself and the people (24). Together with the flesh of the burnt-offering was also burned the fat of the previously slain sin-offerings. The flesh of the latter (ver. 27), with their skins and dung, was to be sent forth without the camp, and there burned (comp. § 139). The man who performed this office was, according to ver. 28, to wash his clothes and bathe, and afterwards to return to the camp. It was not until all connected with the act of atonement to be performed on this day was completed, that the festival offerings prescribed, Num. xxix. 7, 11, for the day were offered, as tradition distinctly asserts (25).

(1) Compare my article *Day of Atonement* in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* xxi. p. 446 sq. The traditional institutions concerning the Day of Atonement are given in the Talmudic treatise *Joma*, the Mishna text of which was first separately edited by Sheringham in the year 1648, with explanations, which are also adopted in the Surenhus edition of the Mishna. The Thosaphta to the treatise *Joma* is printed in Ugolino's *Thes. antiq. sacr.* xviii. p. 153 sq., as is also the Jerusalem Gemara thereto. A translation of the section on the ritual of the Day of Atonement from *Maimonides hajad hachazaka* is given by Delitzsch in his *Commentary to the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 749 sqq. Compare also Lightfoot, *ministerium templi*, Kap. 15 (*opp.* i. p. 744 sqq.); Lund, *jüdische Heiligthümer*, p. 1027 sqq.; J. G. Carpzov, *appar. antiq. s. cod.* p. 433 sqq.; J. A. Danz, *functio pontif. M. in adyto anniversaria*, in Meuschen's *Nov. Test. ex Talm. illustr.* p. 912 sqq.; Bähr, *Symbolik des mos. Kultus*, ii. p. 664 sqq.; Winer, *bibl. Realwörterbuch, in loc.;* Hengstenberg, *die Bücher Mose's und Aegypten*, p. 164 sqq.; Keil, *bibl. Archäol.* i. p. 400 sqq.; Kurtz, *der alttest. Opferkultus*, p. 335 sqq., etc.

(2) Comp. on this date the calendar of festivals given, § 145.

(3) Comp. Lev. xvi. 29–31, xxiii. 27, 29. This command was the better calculated to produce an appreciation of the serious nature of this solemnity, inasmuch as no other fast was prescribed by the Mosaic law (comp. § 134).

Digitized by Google

(4) It was called by the Rabbis יוֹם רַבָּא, the great fast, to distinguish it from other subsequently appointed days of fasting. On the artificial manner in which Philo, in the passage cited, refers the fast to the completed ingathering of the harvest, see the article quoted, p. 448 sq.

(5) It is, moreover, peculiar to the Mosaic institutions to accumulate acts of atonement, for the express purpose of producing a consciousness of their inadequacy (comp. what is said § 98).

(6) Is it conceivable that pardon was to be obtained by the sacrifice of the Day of Atonement for him who in the course of the past year had transgressed the law "with a high hand" (comp. § 137), but escaped the penalty to be inflicted by it? Or, to bring forward a special case by way of example, can it be supposed that, if the penalty prescribed by Num. xxxv. 33 and Deut. xix. 13 as an expiation for murder had been left uninflicted, the atonement made on this day would have been regarded as a compensation?

(7) Each individual Israelite might appropriate to himself this atoning grace, so far as he was truly a member of the congregation thus seeking God's grace, and proved himself to be such by professing contrition in the manner prescribed, Lev. xvi. 31, xxiii. 27 sq. No sacrifice, on the other hand, could avail (comp. 1 Sam. iii. 14) for him who, by wilfully cherishing sin, separated himself from the covenant. This is the manner in which the statements of Lev. xvi. 16, 21, 30, may be reconciled with Heb. ix. 7, v. 2. When the Epistle to the Hebrews refers the act of the Day of Atonement merely to the *ἀγνοήματα* of the people, this expression is not meant to exclude all sins consciously committed from the atonement, but to express the contrast to those transgressions in which, as subsequent impenitence testified, a breach of the covenant was intended.

(8) A special sacrifice was not required for the latter purpose, because the uncleanness cleaving to the sanctuary did not differ from the guilt of the priesthood and people.

(9) For farther particulars see the article quoted, p. 456.

(10) The high priest, in fulfilling the expiatory functions committed to him on this day, was not, as Hofmann (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. p. 148) rightly remarks, to appear before the people in the splendour befitting the delegate of Jehovah, but

Digitized by Google

before the Lord in the simple purity of his God-ordained office. We cannot, however, with Kurtz (*id.* p. 338), see in this injunction a reduction to the garments of the ordinary priests, nor still less, according to the view revived by Knobel *in loco*, a penitential garb. The former notion, according to which the high priest was to officiate on this day not as the chief of the priesthood, but as the priest appointed for the day, is antagonistic to the eminent importance of the act of intercession to be performed, which required that very man, whose dignity equalled that of the whole people, and to whom the full power of the whole priesthood was committed (see § 96). To this may be added, that the girdle of the ordinary priests was not entirely white, and that they wore not the מִצְנֶפֶת, but the מִגְבָּעָה, on their heads. To the second, Keil justly raises the objection: Where in all the world are garments of dazzling whiteness worn as symbols of mourning or penitence?

(11) The high priest wore the white linen garments on the day on which he was to enter the Holy of Holies, the abode of the Divine Shekinah, for the same reason for which they are ascribed (Ezek. ix. 2, 3, 11, x. 2, 6, 7; Dan. x. 5, xii. 6 sq.) to those most exalted of the heavenly beings who stand nearest to the throne of God. On the other hand, the inability of the high priest Joshua to intercede for the people is intimated in the vision, Zech. iii. 3, by the filthy garments which were upon him.

(12) Another view regards עֲזָאזֵל as the name of the place to which the goat was to be led, and especially as that of a mountain in the neighbourhood of Sinai. But though no weight may be laid upon the objection that no such place occurs elsewhere, still the wording of vers. 8 and 10, viz. the expression, to cast lots on a goat for a place, and the connection with הַמִּדְבָּרָה, would be in the highest degree unnatural.

(13) The word *ἀποπομπαῖος*, indeed, signifies not that which is dismissed or sent away, but, like the Latin *averruncus*, he who dismisses, who averts = *ἀλεξίκακος*. We are not quite justified in regarding Azazel as equivalent to Satan, as Hengstenberg insists, because he does not appear in the Pentateuch; still the idea of Azazel is at all events akin to the idea of Satan.

(14) For the *altar of burnt-offering*, upon which fire was burning continually, is intended (see *Joma*, iv. 3), and not, as

Digitized by Google

Bähr (*e.g. id.* p. 669) supposes, the altar of incense, on which was no fuel.

(15) The cloud produced by the incense, Lev. xvi. 13, must (as already remarked, § 118, note 1) be distinguished from the cloud mentioned in ver. 2, in which the Lord appears over the mercy-seat. See on this subject Neumann, *die Wolke im Allerheiligsten*, in the *Luth. Zeitschr.* 1851, p. 70 sqq.; Kurtz, *id.* p. 339; also Keil and Knobel on Lev. xvi. 10.

(16) This latter sprinkling evidently concerned not the mercy-seat, but the place in which it was, *i.e.* the Holy of Holies. Hence the first and single sprinkling must be referred (as by Kurtz, *idem*, p. 340, and Keil *in loco*) to the personal purification of the High Priest and the priesthood, the second and sevenfold to the purification of the sanctuary, which had been polluted by the sinful atmosphere of the priests. (According to another explanation, the former portion of ver. 14 is to be regarded merely as a more general direction, the particulars of the action being delayed to the second. The Vulgate assumes this view by combining the two sentences into one.)

(17) Keil and Kurtz justly maintain that the altar of burnt-offering is referred to in Lev. xvi. 18, while the ordinary explanation of the passage asserts, on the contrary, that the altar of incense within the sanctuary is intended by "the altar that is before the Lord," and consequently regards ver. 18 as adding supplementary particulars to ver. 16. The objections raised against the former view by Delitzsch and Hofmann are obviated by Kurtz, p. 341 sq. The atonement for the altar of burnt-offering was effected by applying to its horns the blood of the bullock and the goat, and then by sprinkling the blood upon it seven times with the finger. (The expression עָלָיו forbids us to suppose a sprinkling of the ground before the altar, which, as Kurtz aptly remarks, is explained by the circumstance, that in the court of the tabernacle not the whole space but only the altar is the place of Divine revelation.) The first act again refers to the atonement for the priesthood and people, the second to the purification of the holy place.

(18) The words לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו in Lev. xvi. 10 are so difficult that it is not surprising that they have been rejected as an unskilful gloss (as by Ritschl). The interpretation (*e.g.* by Klaiber), "*ut per eum fiat expiatio*," is as contrary to the usage of the language

Digitized by Google

as "*ad expiandum eum sc. Deum;*" neither does the hitherto admitted meaning, "that an atonement may be made upon him," agree with the prevailing use of כִּפֶּר עַל. Besides, what follows ver. 21 is no act of expiation.

(19) For, according to the statements of the whole chapter, the כִּפֶּר עַל was always effected by the sprinkling or application of blood. The omission of a particular so easily supplied from the context cannot seem surprising in a section in which so much brevity is used.

(20) All victims indeed were, so far as they were without blemish, in themselves pure. But it is quite another case when the animal is to represent the people, not with their unatoned transgressions, but as having been already atoned for. Such representation can only take place by effecting an act of expiation for the animal itself.

(21) Not merely one hand, as in the Semichah, but two, to make the transaction, as Keil remarks, the more solemn and impressive.

(22) That the high priest might have immediate information of the arrival of the goat at its destination, a kind of telegraphic line of watchmen on eminences, to give signals by waving cloths, was subsequently made from Jerusalem to the wilderness (*Joma*, vi. 8; comp. also Geiger, *Lesestücke aus der Mischna*, p. 16 sq.).

(23) These were to be preserved from all defiling contact, by being kept in the sanctuary.

(24) This, according to Lev. xvi. 24, was again an atonement for himself and the people, because even after the great act of atonement, no offerings could be made without the atoning element present in every burnt-offering.

(25) The same offerings that were prescribed for the first day of the seventh month, viz. a bullock, a ram, and seven yearling lambs for a burnt-offering, with their corresponding meat-offerings, viz. of fine flour kneaded with oil, three-tenths of an ephah for the bullock, two-tenths for the ram, and one-tenth for each of the seven lambs, and finally a he-goat as a sin-offering. These sacrifices were, as at other festivals, independent of the continual burnt-offering with which the day began and ended. According to tradition (*M. Joma*, vii. 4; Maimonides, iv. 2, at the close), the high priest, after the evening

Digitized by Google

sacrifice, again put on the linen garments, to fetch from the Holy of Holies the incense vessels (pan and vase) which had been left there. Thus tradition asserts a fourfold entry of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies, while the law, Lev. xvi., supposes that he entered it at least twice, or, according to the most natural understanding of ver. 12, more probably three times. To the notion of a fourth entry, however, nothing decided can be opposed. From the description of the Day of Atonement in Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 10. 3, nothing can be ascertained on this point, as he omits all mention of the offering of incense. The information furnished by Philo (*Legat. ad Caj. M.* ii. p. 591), in a letter to King Herod Agrippa, expressly includes, on the contrary, a three- or four-fold entrance. It is as follows: *κἂν αὐτὸς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς δυσὶν ἡμέραις τοῦ ἔτους ἢ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ τρὶς ἢ καὶ τετράκις εἰς φοιτήσῃ, θάνατον ἀπαραίτητον ὑπομένει.* The genuineness of this writing has, however, been disputed on good grounds (see Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iii. 2, p. 488 sq.). When it is said, Heb. ix. 7, of the high priest that he entered once every year into the holiest place, the expression, like the similar one, Josephus, *bell. jud.* v. 5. 7; 3 Macc. i. 11; Philo, *monarch.* ed. M. ii. p. 223, is to be explained by its contrast to *διὰ παντός*; it stands *de uno anni die et de uno eodemque ministerio*, as Deyling (*de ingressu summi pontif.*, etc., *Obs.* ii. p. 183) has already justly remarked. If, as has been also already attempted, the functions of censing and of the twofold sprinkling are to be compressed into one single entrance of the high priest into the Holy of Holies, recourse must be had to unnatural hypotheses. The different views of older theologians on this subject are collected in the above-named work of Deyling. Compare also especially the discussion of this matter by Danz (in *Meuschen*, p. 954 sqq.).

§ 141.

Continuation: Signification of the Ritual and Antiquity of the Day of Atonement.

After what has been said, § 127, 139, on atoning sacrifice, we have only to add what follows on the signification of the ritual

Digitized by Google

of the Day of Atonement. Of course the greatest prominence must be given in this ritual to that element in the sacrifice by which an atonement for sin is effected, and to that portion of the sacrificial transaction which specifically subserves this end. If the *pœna vicaria* is the idea upon which the sin-offering is founded, it is here if anywhere that we should expect to find it most distinctly impressed. But nothing at all is said of substitutionary suffering for sin, either on the part of the bullock and the goat whose blood was brought into the Holy of Holies, or of the goat which was dismissed into the wilderness, the slaying of the sin-offering being spoken of in the fewest possible words. It must be conceded (as has been already done, § 127, note 13) that the subsequent connection of this idea with the slaughter of the victim was a natural one (1), —that its death must be received not merely as the *means* of obtaining the blood, but also as an act of satisfaction. But nowhere in the laws concerning sacrifice can we find a foundation for the dogma, that it is only because the victim *accomplishes* something for the offerer, by vicariously suffering the penalty of death, that its life, offered in the blood, can serve as an atonement for him (2). On the contrary, it is only the nature of the victim, its purity and freedom from blemish, that are here dwelt on (3). The connection also of the idea of the *pœna vicaria* with the sending away of the second goat, by later Judaism, rests entirely on a misunderstanding. For the sins laid upon the latter were those already *forgiven*, not those that had to be atoned for, unless we are to regard them as symbolically punished twice over. The meaning of the confession of sin made (according to ver. 21) over the second goat can only be that of a declaration, that past sins being forgiven, are now done away with,—are dismissed and relegated to the evil spirit, whose realm is situate beyond all connection with the abode of the holy people. In like manner does the bird, set free at the purification of the *leprous* man and house, symbolically take away the leprosy with him (Lev. xiv. 7, 53).

Digitized by Google

It is also an error to see in the second goat an offering to Azazel (4). Mosaism acknowledges no evil power independent of God, whose favour must be in some way secured. The question is not to propitiate, but to get rid of Azazel—to declare to him that the nation, now that it has obtained forgiveness of sin, has nothing to do with him, the patron of evil (5). Hengstenberg ingeniously discovers in this transaction with Azazel a reference to the Typhonic rites of the Egyptians. Typhon is the evil god who dwells especially in the Libyan desert, and who must be propitiated in times of pestilence. But while the Egyptian religion held it necessary to enter into relations with the powers of evil, for the sake of being secure from their enmity, Israel was to be taught by the rites of the Day of Atonement, that they had only to satisfy the holy God for their sins, and that when this was done the power of evil could do them no harm. Diestel, on the other hand, endeavours to show (*Set-Typhon, Asasel, und Satan, Zeitschr. für histor. Theol.* 1860, p. 159 sq.) that the notion of Typhon as the evil principle is much later than the times of Moses, and not earlier than the 10th or 11th century before Christ (6).

The Day of Atonement forming the climax of what the Mosaic ritual was able from its own resources to effect with respect both to extent and degree of atonement, it closes the enactments concerning expiation, and may from this point of view be denominated its *Supreme Solemnity* (7). *Without the Day of Atonement there would be an actual gap in the theocratic ordinances.* The law whose task was the restoration of a holy people, but which was at the same time continually discovering the opposition in which this people stand to the holy God through their sinfulness, could not be without an institution to show the way in which this opposition might be reconciled by an atonement for the congregation, and also relatively to secure such reconciliation; while at the same time, being weak through the flesh, it pointed beyond itself to that perfect atonement whose result will be the restoration of the truly sanctified

Digitized by Google

people of God (comp. Zech. iii. 9, Heb. ix. 6 sq.) (8). Ewald (*Alterthümer*, ed. 1, p. 368, ed. 3, p. 477), seeing more clearly in this matter than uncircumcised criticism of the ordinary stamp, designates the Day of Atonement "a genuine Mosaic festival, in which, more than in any other, the whole tendency as well as the full strictness of the higher religion was expressed." When the silence of other books of the Old Testament is adduced as an objection to the antiquity of this festival, the doubtful nature of such an argument is evident from the fact, that we must then, to be consistent, postpone its origin till the third century before Christ; for the first intimation of this festival, apart from the probable allusion to it in Zech. iii. 9, is found in Wisdom l. 5, in the description of the splendid appearance of the high priest Simon on coming out of the Holy of Holies, and in 3 Macc. i. 11. It was a solemnity carried on in silence, and except in the matter of the fast observed by the people, entirely confined to the sanctuary, and thus furnished no occasion for observation (9). At most, it might have been mentioned in 1 Kings viii. 65, and 2 Chron. vii. 9, etc., when it took place during the seven days' festival held at the dedication of Solomon's temple; an essential portion of this solemnity (the purification of the sanctuary) was performed, however, in the very act of dedication (10).

(1) The modern Jewish ceremony called the Kapporeth, and performed on the day of preparation for this solemnity, is founded entirely on the notion of substitution. A man takes a cock, a woman a hen (of a white colour, on account of Isa. i. 18), and before killing strike three times on their foreheads, saying the words: זה חליפתי זה תחתי זה כפרתי זה התרנגול ילך למיתה ואני אלך לחיים טובים עם כל ישראל אמן, "May this cock [or hen] be an exchange for me, may it be in my stead! May it be a propitiation for me! Let this cock go to death, but may I go to a good life with all Israel! Amen." The four capital punishments of strangling, beheading, stoning, and burning are symbolized on the cock. See the description of the ceremony in Buxtorf's *Synagoga judaica*, ed. 3, cap. xxv. p. 509 sqq.

Digitized by Google

(2) As is also expressed by Küper (*das Priesterthum des alten Bundes*, 1866, p. 125). In so important a matter we are fully justified in appealing to the *argumentum e silentio*.

(3) The blood is regarded as a means of atonement which God has *given* to His people upon the altar (Lev. xvii. 11), to enable him who by reason of his sinfulness could not approach God, to draw near, because the life of the sinless animal intervenes to atone for his soul. Wherein, then, lies the efficacy of the expiation made on the Day of Atonement by means of the blood of the victim? Not in an increased quantity of the means of atonement. Not the blood of a hecatomb, but only the blood of a single animal is needed as an atonement for the high priest and people. It is, moreover, characteristic of the sin-offerings in general, that they are all limited to a single animal. The reason truly is, that the speciality of the sin-offering is not the *gift*, the oblation on the part of the offerer, in which case there might be, as the burnt-offerings show, a question of more or less, but the covering prescribed of God, by a means which, in virtue of its *quality* (as substituting a *soul* for the soul), is adapted to this end, but which by reason of this very quality is incapable of enhancement. (In this manner might the view stated by Kurtz, *idem*, p. 156, be completed.) The atonement made on the Day of Atonement was super-eminent, because on this occasion the blood was brought as near to God as possible, before His throne, and indeed within the veil, into that central seat of His abode at other times unapproachable, thus making satisfaction for the people in the very place where the accusing law within the ark testified against them. The people, knowing themselves to be accepted with favour through the atoning blood, were assured of the continued dwelling of God in their midst, and therewith of the continuance of their state of grace, while the ordinary intercourse effected in worship between God and the congregation received a fresh consecration from this centre,—the blood taken into the Holy of Holies serving for the cleansing of even the outmost parts of the sanctuary.

(4) This explanation is inadmissible, even when the offering is taken in the broader meaning of a gift by which, according to rabbinical views, the devil (Sammael) was to be induced

Digitized by Google

not to render the sacrifice offered by Israel as an atonement inefficacious, and to become not an accuser of, but an intercessor for the people (see Eisenmenger, *entdecktes Judenthum*, ii. p. 155 sq.; Bähr, *id.* 686).

(5) If the subsequently occurring idea of Satan is unjustifiably transferred to Azazel, the notion that he can no longer accuse Israel before God, nor provoke God's wrath and chastisement against them, would have to be added (see Kurtz, *id.* p. 359). Besides, the second goat, considered in itself, cannot be regarded as a sacrifice. Both goats are indeed (Lev. xvi. 5) said to be לְחַטָּאת, but this only denotes in a general manner the purpose for which the two are together brought forward, while in vers. 9 and 15 the first goat which is slain is specially called חַטָּאת, but not the second. The latter, on whom the result of the atonement just offered is fulfilled, takes the place of the slain goat, and is, as it were, and as it is often designated, the *hircus redivivus*. Jewish tradition also recognised this relation between the two goats, by prescribing (*Joma*, vi. 1) that they should be alike in colour, size, and value.

(6) The wilderness being the region of impurity, it was natural that the man who led the goat into the wilderness should be commanded to bathe before returning to the camp. On the burning of the flesh of the sin-offering, see § 139. As this took place without the camp, the man who performed it had also to cleanse himself before his return. The supereminent sacredness of the day required, as Kurtz, *idem*, p. 362, justly remarks, that even the barest possibility of Levitical uncleanness being contracted without the camp should be obviated.

(7) The circumstance that this day did not bear the name חַג is discussed in § 144 on the Sacred Seasons.

(8) The need of such an institution is especially seen with respect to the year of jubilee, which, without it, would appear in the national life without cause, and would lack such a close of the preceding period as the Divine holiness demands.

(9) It is also probable that this solemnity, like other institutions of worship, fell for a long period into desuetude.

(10) The Day of Atonement is omitted in the prophetic

Digitized by Google

bunch of hyssop dipped into water into which some of these ashes had been cast. The *red* colour in these symbols of purification must not be explained (as by Hengstenberg) as a symbol of sin, because red was in Egypt the symbol of Typhon; nor the red heifer combined, as by Schelling (*Philosophie der Offenbarung*, ii. p. 136), with the red bullock to be sacrificed to Typhon (Plutarch, *de Ig. et Osir.* cap. 31). Isa. i. 18 proves nothing in this matter,—red there certainly referring, as the colour of blood, to deeds of blood (see vers. 15 and 21), while the death with whose expiation the red heifer was concerned is not represented as blood-shedding, but as corruption. Red is rather the colour of life and of vital energy; scarlet the colour of splendour; the animal is a female, the sex that brings forth, properly representing life (comp. Gen. iii. 5). Cedar, as the most durable of woods, is likewise a symbol of incorruption; while great purifying power was in ancient times always ascribed to hyssop. Thus the water of purification is an *infusion* strengthened by *elements which symbolized vital energy, incorruption, and purity* (4).

(1) Compare Sommer, *bibl. Abhandl.* p. 200 sqq.; Kurtz on the Symbolical Dignity of the Rite prescribed in Num. xix. for the Annulling of the Uncleanness of Death, in Ullmann's *Studien*, 1846, No. 3, p. 629 sqq.

(2) Some understand by this the injury done to walls by dry-rot, while others, on the contrary, think a transference of human leprosy to the walls of a house possible.

(3) Not of the High Priest, who might not come in contact with anything relating to death or corruption.

(4) Quite otherwise, but very artificially, does Hengstenberg explain this. "Cedar and hyssop," he says, "are, according to 1 Kings v. 13, the most exalted and the meanest of God's works of creation, and are therefore symbolical, on the one hand of the Creator's elevation and majesty, on the other of His condescension and humility." With respect to the ceremonies by which the purification of a recovered leper (Lev. xiv. 1–32) or of a leprous house (vers. 33–57) was effected,

Digitized by Google

the meaning of the essential points is determined by what has already been said; compare also what is remarked on this subject in § 140 sq.

§ 143.

2. *Acts of Purification for removing the Suspicion of Guilt.*

Of an entirely different character were those acts of purification which related to the repudiation of suspected crimes, viz. adultery and murder.

Among these are (1st) the *jealousy-offering*, and the *drinking of the water of cursing*, treated of Num. v. 11–31, and already mentioned in § 104. 1, where a statement of the marriage laws is given (1). This jealousy-offering, which a husband had to present to the priest when he placed his wife, whom he suspected of adultery, before the altar, consisted of *barley meal without the addition of oil and frankincense.* This offering does not, however, as Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii. p. 446) supposes, concern the husband, but is, as ver. 15 plainly says, "her offering for her" (2). It is called, ver. 15, "an offering of memorial, bringing iniquity to remembrance;" *i.e.*, it is to bring the iniquity of the wife to the remembrance of God, that He may effect its detection. This offering, even though it be forced upon the woman, is purely one of supplication. There is in this case no question of any atonement (כִּפֻּר), for sin is not to be covered, but discovered (3). The nature of an offering must correspond with the case in question; the capacity in which the offerer appears before God must be impressed upon it. This offering, which is composed of the meanest kind of meat-offering, is not, however, intended (as Keil, *Archäol.* i. p. 299, explains it) as a symbol of the kind of life hitherto led by the woman, for the Divine judgment concerning this is yet to be obtained (4). On the contrary, without involving any prejudging of the past, it exhibits in an entirely objective manner the condition in which the offerer is placed (5).

Digitized by Google

As an accused person appears before the tribunal in mourning attire, without question of his guilt or innocence being in any way affected, so may this sacrifice be said to exhibit a merely *gloomy character*. Hence its material was not fine wheat flour, but the less esteemed barley meal (6). The absence of the oil and incense, the usual accompaniments of the Mincha, was designed, according to our view, merely to express still more emphatically the gloomy nature of the offering, which was to be neither savoury nor sweet-scented (7).

The further proceedings were as follow. The priest placed the accused before the Lord, by leading her before the altar of burnt-offering in the court of the tabernacle. He then took *holy* water in an *earthen* vessel, *i.e.* probably some of the water kept for sacred purposes in the laver in the court (Ex. xxx. 18) (8), and placed therein dust from *the floor of the tabernacle*. He then *uncovered the head of the woman*, placed the meat-offering in her hands, and himself holding the vessel in which was the "curse-causing water of pain," invoked a curse upon her, to the effect that if she were guiltless she should be free from the effects of the water of cursing, but that if she were guilty this water should enter into her body "to cause her belly to swell and her thigh to rot" (9). The woman having taken the curse upon her by twice saying: Amen, the priest wrote the curses (according to Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 11. 16, merely the name of God) upon a paper, or, according to tradition, upon a roll of parchment (*διφθέρα*, Josephus, comp. *Sota*, ii. 4), and wiped out the writing with the water of cursing. He then took the offering of jealousy out of the woman's hand, waved it before the Lord, and burnt a handful of it upon the altar as a memorial (see § 129), and gave the woman the water to drink (10).

The *uncovering of the head* (by removing the veil and unbinding the hair) did not express (as Theodoret explains it) that all things are naked and open before God, but denoted the defilement which the woman had contracted in virtue of the accusa-

Digitized by Google

tion brought against her, the veiling of the head being the token of female modesty. An *earthen* vessel was employed, as being of little value. The mingling of dust in the water may be explained (as first suggested by Bähr, *idem*, p. 443) by Gen. iii. 14, comp. with Ps. lxxii. 9, Mic. vii. 17, Isa. xlix. 23, according to which passages, to eat dust was a general mark of meriting a curse, or of the deepest shame and humiliation. *Holy* water and dust *from the floor of the sanctuary* were used, to enhance the efficacy of the potion, which thus appeared all the more to be the vehicle of the Divine holiness, whose property is to destroy all that is sinful. In virtue of the efficacy imparted to the water by the words of the oath, and by the blotting out of the written curse, it was called the "curse-causing water of pain" (11). The entrance of the curse into the inmost parts of the body was to be effected by drinking (comp. the expression, Ps. cix. 18). We say *effected*, not merely symbolized. For, according to the simple meaning of the words of ver. 27, the water is to be regarded not merely as the symbol and pledge, but as the actual vehicle of the Divine curse (12). Any element of magic is excluded by the ethic element which was added, inasmuch as the effect of the potion was promoted by the anxiety of an evil conscience in the case of the guilty woman, and averted by the gladness of a good conscience in that of the innocent (13).

(2d) *The purification of a community from the suspicion of blood-guiltiness*, when a slain man was found in the neighbourhood, and the murderer could not be discovered. For this case the law (Deut. xxi. 1–9) prescribed that the elders of the city should lead a young heifer, which had not yet been wrought with, into a valley in which was a brook, and should there, in the presence of the priests, break its neck, and wash their hands over the slain heifer, saying: Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Be merciful, O Lord, unto Thy people Israel, whom Thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood in the midst of Thy people Israel,

Digitized by Google

i.e. let not this blood shed in our midst be laid to our charge, etc. *The object of this transaction* was not an atonement. There was here no question of a transgression committed (בִּשְׁגָגָה); and the expression denoting the slaughter of the victim is not שָׁחַט, but עָרַף. The blood shed was to be removed from the midst of the people, and this was effected by the symbolical infliction of capital punishment upon the heifer. This was to proceed from the elders, because, according to ch. xix. 12, it was upon them that the duty of inquiring into mortal injuries in general devolved. Here, then, the idea of a *pœna vicaria* applies: satisfaction is to be made to Divine justice by a symbolical infliction of punishment, which thus serves, ver. 8, for a covering of blood-guiltiness to the community in question. The elders, by the *act of washing hands*, deny, in the name of the community, all participation in the mortal injury which has been done; perhaps the brook was to carry away also the blood of the heifer. The priests do not in this instance officiate as mediators of atonement, but, ver. 5, merely as witnesses and judicial functionaries.

(1) Compare my article, *The Jealousy-Offering*, in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* xix. p. 472 sq. An explanation of this offering, as well as the subsequent practice, is given in the Talmudic treatise *Sota*, edited, with an ample commentary, by Wagenseil, 1674; compare also Selden, *uxor hebraica*, iii. chs. 13–15; Lund, *jüdische Heiligthümer*, p. 701 sq.

(2) It was, according to ver. 25, taken out of the hand of the woman. The husband necessarily furnished the materials, both because the wife, as such, had no property of her own, and especially because the whole transaction originated with him, and was performed without regard to the consent of the wife.

(3) An offering in a general sense was, however, needed, because, as Bähr, *idem*, p. 445, quite correctly states it, according to the Mosaic ordinances no one who approached the Lord in His sanctuary for any purpose was to appear empty (Ex. xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 20), *i.e.* not without an offering. Hence the pre-

Digitized by Google

sentation of an offering was to precede the drinking of the water of cursing, as an introduction to the whole transaction.

(4) It could not, as Kurtz, *id.*, states, correspond on the one hand with the questionableness of the woman's fame and conduct, and yet be, on the other (p. 395), a symbol of her innocence.

(5) As the nature of an offering was in many cases decided by the external position of the offerer,—by his rank in the theocracy, or the extent of his property,—so in this case also it corresponded with the external condition of a woman to whom the stain of the most grievous accusation was affixed.

(6) Comp. Hos. iii. 2, where barley appears as the food becoming an adulteress. The Jewish explanation goes so far as to say (*Sota*, ii. 1) that, because the act of the adulteress placed her on a level with the cattle, her offering also must consist of the food of the cattle. In this case, however, the woman would be assumed to be guilty, which is out of the question.

(7) Comp. § 125, conclusion. According to Keil and Kurtz, it was meant to express that the works of the woman were not animated by the Spirit of God, nor performed in a praying frame of mind. See the Rabbinic explanations in Wagenseil, *id.* p. 315 sq.

(8) So Onkelos, and *Sota*, ii. 2; while the LXX., on the contrary, translate *ὕδωρ καθαρὸν ζῶν*, and thus understand it simply as pure spring water.

(9) During the transaction, time was still given to the woman to confess; a pause is probably to be assumed after ver. 20.

(10) The meaning of the offering (discussed above, note 3) and ver. 26 require that the drinking of the water should take place after the presentation of the offering, and not *vice versâ* (as *Sota*, iii. 2, while quoting also the opposite view, states); hence ver. 24 must be regarded as an anticipative remark. "And when he hath made her to drink the water," continues the law, ver. 27, "if she be defiled, and have committed unfaithfulness against her husband, the water that causeth the curse shall enter into her for pain, so that her belly shall swell and her thigh shall rot, and the woman shall be a curse among her people. And if the woman be not defiled, but be clean, then she shall be pronounced guiltless, and shall conceive seed."

Digitized by Google

The man, however, who subjected his wife to these proceedings was in any case, even if she was found innocent, to be guiltless.

(11) The expression מָרִים is to be referred, as is shown especially by ver. 27, not to the bitter taste, but to the pernicious effects of the water. The Rabbinists, on the contrary, understood the word literally, and disputed whether anything bitter was mingled in the water, or whether it first acquired a bitter taste in the mouth of the adulteress who drank of it.

(12) Keil justly remarks (*idem*, p. 301) that this water is said to acquire, through the word and power of God, a supernatural power, which, though not to be conceived of as magical, is indeed of so spiritually miraculous a kind as to produce pernicious effects upon the body of the guilty, and to be harmless to the innocent.

(13) For later traditions, see the article quoted, p. 475 sq.

III.—THE SACRED SEASONS.

I. THE SACRED SEASONS IN GENERAL (1).

§ 144.

Survey of the Sacred Seasons and their Designations.

The consecration of the course of time in general was effected by the morning and evening sacrifice, עוֹלַת תָּמִיד (of which we spoke, § 131). Besides this, however, special times were also selected, which, establishing by a regular interchange of labour and rest a rule of *natural* life corresponding with a need of human nature, offered at the same time a substratum for the communion taking place in worship between God and His people. Such sacred seasons, as appointed in the Pentateuch, were, 1*st*, The seventh day of the week, or *Sabbath*; 2*d*, The *new moons*,—the first-born, as it were, among the days of the month. These were of subordinate importance, with the exception of the seventh new moon, which was invested with a festal character, and bore the name of יוֹם תְּרוּעָה, the Day of

Digitized by Google

Trumpets. *3d*, The three festival pilgrimages, when the whole congregation assembled at the sanctuary, viz.: *a.* the *Passover*, with which the annual cycle of festivals commenced in spring, celebrated in the first month of the Mosaic year (Ex. xii. 2), on the evening of the 14th Abib or Nisan, with the seven days of unleavened bread, kept from the 15th day of the same month onwards; *b.* the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost), seven weeks later; *c.* the Feast of Tabernacles, from the 15th day of the seventh month onwards. *4th*, The seventh month Tisri, besides being distinguished, as above remarked, by the festal character of its new moon, included also the Day of Atonement (יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים). In this month the עֲצֶרֶת (Lev. xxiii. 36) (2), which took place on the eighth day, *i.e.* after the seven days' celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles (the 22d day of the month), terminated the festal half of the year. *5th*, Every seventh year was also sacred as the *sabbatical year*, and every seventh sabbatical year as the *year of jubilee*. The laws concerning sacred seasons in general are contained in Ex. xxiii. 10–17, Lev. xxiii. and xxv., Num. xxviii., xxix., and Deut. xvi. In Deuteronomy as well as in Exodus, only the three festival pilgrimages are mentioned; while the sabbatical solemnities (except in the Decalogue, v. 12 sq.) and the new moons are passed over in silence. This circumstance is explained by the consideration that it is in these festival pilgrimages alone that stress is laid upon that oneness of the sanctuary which it is the special object of Deuteronomy in its enactments concerning worship to inculcate (see Deut. xvi. 5–7, 11, 15, 16) (3).

The most general *designation* of the sacred seasons succeeding in their appointed order is מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה,—מוֹעֵד signifying an appointed time in general; comp. Num. xxviii. 2. The expression is also used in the superscription, Lev. xxiii. 2, of all holy days, including the Sabbath, on which a holy convocation (מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ) took place; and therefore, in Ezek. xlvi. 11 (see Hitzig *in loco*), of the new moons also, for these were, according to prophetic legislation, to be days of holy convocation

Digitized by Google

(Ezek. xlvi. 3, comp. with Isa. lxvi. 23), which they were not as yet in the Pentateuch. More frequently, however, the expression מוֹעֲדִים is used in a narrower sense, and restricted, to the exclusion of the new moons and Sabbaths, to the days of assembling at the annual festivals (Lev. xxiii. 4; Ezek. xlvi. 9; 2 Chron. viii. 13, xxxi. 3). Still narrower is the meaning of the word חַג, which is the usual name for the three festival pilgrimages, as the *rejoicing festivals* of the year. The name seems to have arisen from the cheerful dances performed at these seasons (see Judg. xxi. 19–21; compare also, in illustration, Ex. xxxii. 5 with ver. 19), the verbal root חָגַג properly meaning to turn in a circle (4). Hence this word could not be used of the solemn Day of Atonement, which subsequently bore only the name of *the Day*, κ. ἐξ. יוֹמָא, or *the Great Day*, יוֹמָא רַבָּא (5).

(1) Compare my article *Festivals of the Ancient Hebrews* in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* iv. p. 383 sq.

(2) See farther particulars in § 156, the Feast of Tabernacles.

(3) On other differences in the laws concerning the feasts, see the separate discussions concerning them.

(4) In Arabic, the word حج becomes the name by which the pilgrimages to Mecca are denoted.

(5) That the expression חַג is already used, as is frequently asserted, in the Old Testament, κ. ἐξ. of the Feast of Tabernacles as the greatest of the rejoicing festivals of the year, cannot be inferred with any certainty from 1 Kings viii. 2, Ezek. xlv., 2 Chron. vii. 8, since the references made in these passages to the Feast of Tabernacles naturally arises from the context. Judg. xxi. 19 may, moreover, be understood also of the Passover. Comp. Hengstenberg, *Beitr. zur Einl. ins A. T.* iii. p. 80.

Digitized by Google

§ 145.

Reasons which determine the Times of the Feasts.

The *number seven*, which from Gen. ii. 2 sq. onwards is the sign of Divine perfection (1), forms the fundamental type for the regulation of the sacred seasons. It directly determines the order of the sabbatical seasons (§ 147 sq.), and also exerts an influence upon the order of the feasts: for, first, the duration of two of the principal ones is (as appears from § 144) for seven days; secondly, in the annual cycle of festivals, the seven weeks between Passover and Pentecost branch out into a special circle of feasts; and, finally, the entire number of days of holy convocation, *i.e.* of chief days of feasts, amounts to just seven (the Passover and Feast of Tabernacles having each two days of convocation). Amidst the five yearly festivals, the three festal pilgrimages, Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, have both an agrarian and an historical significance, but the latter is in the Old Testament omitted with respect to the Feast of Pentecost (2). The Day of Atonement had, notwithstanding its special and particular significance, an unmistakeable relation to the Feast of Tabernacles: as the Passover introduced the harvest festival of unleavened bread, so did the Day of Atonement lead to the supreme rejoicing of the year in the Feast of Tabernacles. This position of the Day of Atonement indicates that only a people reconciled to God has a right to rejoice in the blessing with which He has crowned the year; see, on the contrary, Hos. ix. 1 sq. (3). The Day of Atonement served also as an introduction to the year of jubilee (§ 152), which, according to the agricultural year, began at harvest (4). No hint is given in the law as to the reason why this solemnity was to take place on the tenth day of the seventh month (5). The choice of the day has undoubtedly a reflex meaning,—the first decade of the sabbath month was thus to be made a season of repentance and self-examination; and modern Judaism has declared the days

Digitized by Google

from the first to the tenth Tisri, days of penitence. The *changes of the moon*, not to mention the new moons, determined the time for celebrating the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles, which both took place at the full moon; the after-Passover was also celebrated by those who were prevented from celebrating the Passover proper, at the next full moon (Num. ix. 9–13, comp. 2 Chron. xxx. 2); hence ἀπὸ σελήνης σημεῖον ἑορτῆς, Wisd. xliii. 7. It must further be stated that the Passover took place about the vernal, the Feast of Tabernacles about the autumnal, equinox (6). Notwithstanding all this, however, it is quite erroneous *to deduce the significance of the sacred seasons of Mosaism from cosmical relations*. For heathenism, indeed, which identifies the life and government of Deity with the life of the world, the seasons of the year, as such, are at the same time God's seasons, and hence the conspicuous elements of the sun's or the moon's course have been chiefly used as solemn seasons (comp. Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. p. 546). According to the Old Testament view, on the contrary, the laws of the heavenly bodies were to serve as a chronometer for the theocratic ordinances (Gen. i. 14; Ps. civ. 19), that the harmony of the laws of nature with the laws of the covenant might be manifested in this manner also. The new moons at most could be regarded as the chronological feasts which George, *e.g.* (*Die älteren jüdischen Feste*, 1835, p. 193 sq.), has called a certain class of Jewish festivals; these hold, however, a very subordinate position in the Pentateuch (see § 150). It may certainly be conjectured, as by Ewald (7), that the Israelites (though we have no sufficient data for the assertion) had a solemnity at the appearance of the full moon, and also solemnities at the seasons of spring and harvest, in pre-Mosaic times; we may also, with Philo (8) and the moderns, see in the splendour of the full moon a special glorification of the Passover and Feast of Tabernacles. But what made these feasts, feasts, and the Sabbaths holy days, was not human choice, guided by the order of nature, but the enactments of the covenant God, who on the one hand

Digitized by Google

preserved by these festivals a lively remembrance of the great facts of His deliverance and guidance of His people (comp. Ex. xiii. 9, Lev. xxiii. 42 sq., etc.), and on the other admonished the people to follow their earthly vocation to an agricultural life, in constant dependence on the Giver of all the blessings of nature, and to regard these blessings as inalienably connected with the ordinances of the covenant.

(1) On the sacred numbers, see Kliefoth, *die Zahlensymbolik der hl. Schrift, theol. Zeitschrift von Dieckhoff und Kliefoth*, 1862, pp. 1–89, 341–453, 509–623; and also Leyrer's article, *Zahlen bei den Hebräern*, in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* xviii. p. 360 sq.

(2) Which may explain why it seems to occupy a lower position than the other two, and is entirely omitted in the prophecy of Ezekiel, xlv. 21 sq.

(3) Comp. Hupfeld, *de primitiva et vera festorum ap. Hebræos ratione*, ii. p. 12: "*Quæ enim esset terræ et proventuum consecratio a populo profano peracta, h. e. communis vitæ labe polluto, nisi antea lustratus et expiatus se denuo sacraverit?*" Hos. ix. 1 sqq., a prophetic saying, referring most probably to the Feast of Tabernacles, resounds the threatening, "Rejoice not, O Israel," etc., in the midst of the harvest-rejoicings of the apostate people.

(4) Even the relation in which the Day of Atonement stands to the year of jubilee, shows that its significance must not be limited to that of an introductory solemnity to the Feast of Tabernacles. The high rank accorded it among the Mosaic solemnities entirely forbids our placing it on a level with the preparation for the Passover on the 10th Nisan (§ 153), which had no festal character at all.

(5) See in Carpzov's *appar. antiq. s. cod.* p. 433, the rabbinical fancies on this subject, viz. because Adam sinned and repented on the 10th Tisri, or because Abraham was circumcised on this day, or because this was the day on which Moses came down from the mount and made an atonement for transgression with the golden calf, etc. Philo (*de septen.* ed. M. ii. p. 297) points to the significance of the number ten as the number of perfection, which he then, in his manner, refers to the ethic value of the fast prescribed on this day. According

Digitized by Google

to Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii. p. 673), the Day of Atonement is by the number ten designated as the most comprehensive and perfect of days; so too Kürtz (*Opferkultus*, p. 336).

(6) Philo, *de septen.* ed. M. ii. p. 297, interprets this point in his own manner. Article, *Feste der alten Hebr.*

(7) Comp. Ewald, *de feriarum hebr. origine ac ratione, Zeitschr. für Kunde des Morgenlandes*, ii. p. 414 sqq.

(8) See Philo, *idem*, p. 297: *ἵνα μὴ μεθ' ἡμέραν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ νύκτωρ πλήρης ὁ κόσμος ᾖ τοῦ παγκάλου φωτός.* Comp. p. 293.

§ 146.

The Celebration of the Holy Days.

On the *celebration of the holy days*, the following general remarks may be made.

1. Besides the sacrifices prescribed for every day, certain *especial public sacrifices*, differing in character according to the several festivals, also took place. The laws respecting these are found Num. xxviii. and xxix.

2. On seven annual feast-days (the days of convocation mentioned § 145), namely, the first and seventh days of unleavened bread, the day of the Feast of Weeks, the new moon Sabbath, the Day of Atonement, and the first and last days of the Feast of Tabernacles, *rest from labour* was commanded as well as on the *weekly Sabbath*. There was, however, this difference, that while on the weekly Sabbath and the Day of Atonement all labour (כָּל־מְלָאכָה) was forbidden (Lev. xxiii. 3, 31, comp. with Num. xxix. 7), on the other above-named six days of rest only כָּל־מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה (Vulg. *servile opus*) was proscribed, Lev. xxiii. 7, 8, 21, 25, 35, 36, comp. Num. xxviii. 18, etc. The latter did not exclude, as is evident from Ex. xii. 16, the preparation of food (1). Hence in the Pentateuch the expression שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן (high day of rest), denoting the stricter abstinence from work, is used only of the weekly Sabbath and the Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 31, comp. xxiii. 28; while even the simpler expression שַׁבָּת is applied only to the rest-days of the

Digitized by Google

feast of the seventh month (2), and, according to the common explanation of Lev. xxiii. 11, 15, to the first *Mazzoth* day (3). In the intervening days of the two feast weeks work was permitted (4).

3. The *positive* element in the celebration of the *weekly Sabbaths* and the *sabbatical feast-days* is contained in the regularly recurring formula מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ of Lev. xxiii. and Num. xxviii. This expression does not mean, as the LXX. and Vulgate understand it, *κλητὴ ἁγία ἔσται ὑμῖν, vocabitur sanctus*, or, as Coccejus and Vitringa (see *Synag. vet.* p. 288 sq.), and among moderns Saalschütz (*Mosaisches Recht*, p. 387), by comparing Ex. xxxii. 5, Jer. xxxvi. 9, explain it, *indictio sancti, proclamatio sanctitatis*, but a *holy calling together*, and is intended to signify, as Ezekiel, xlvi. 3, 9, expresses it, that the people were to come to the sanctuary to worship. A *universal command*, however, to appear in the sanctuary (the רָאִיָה, according to later designation) only took place with regard to the three festal pilgrimages, and then was given only to the male population, Ex. xxiii. 14, 17, Deut. xvi. 16 (5).

4. They who came to the feasts were not to appear before the Lord *empty* (Ex. xxiii. 15, comp. xxxiv. 20, Deut. xvi. 16), but each, as ver. 17 says, "was to give according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which He hath given thee." This refers to the free-will offerings, ver. 10, the Deuteronomian tenths (§ 136. 3), the first-born of cattle (§ 136. 1) (6), the first-fruits (§ 136. 2), etc., and the peace-offerings formed of them, which were preceded by burnt-offerings, Num. x. 10, festal repasts following, comp. 2 Chron. xxx. 22 (7).

(1) See the thorough discussion of this matter in Gusset's *lex. hebr.* ed. 2, pp. 817 sq. and 1582. Hence the Talmudists distinguish between the Sabbath of creation (*i.e.* the weekly Sabbath) and the feast-Sabbath.

(2) Probably (as Gusset, *idem*, p. 1581, perceives) because these days derived a specially sabbatical character from the sabbatic month.

Digitized by Google

(3) According to another interpretation, Lev. xxiii. 11, 15 refers only to the weekly Sabbath (see Hupfeld, *idem*, p. 4). Bähr's assertion, *idem*, p. 582, that in the Old Testament the word Sabbath sometimes also designates the whole system of feasts and festal seasons, is quite incorrect. On the form of the word שַׁבָּתוֹן=σαββατισμός, see Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrb.* § 163 *d.*

(4) The laws by which this liberty was subsequently limited, are given in the Mishna treatise *Moëd Katon*, ii. 11.

(5) On the Talmudic designation of the festival pilgrimages as רְגָלִים, arising from Ex. xxiii. 14, and the meaning of this expression, see the above-cited article, p. 386.

(6) See on the last point, Riehm, *Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, p. 52 sqq.

(7) These *private offerings* at feasts are called in Talmudic diction חגיגה; see certain more modern rabbinical definitions in Saalschütz, *id.* p. 422. Comp. the summary of requisites for the feasts, in Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 10. 6. Very few notices of the sacred seasons are found in the canonical books after the Pentateuch. This applies especially to the *book of Joshua*, which mentions (ver. 10) only the first Passover celebrated in the land of Canaan. If this book, closely connected as it is with the Pentateuch, and acknowledged to presuppose it, makes no further mention of festal celebrations and such matters, it must be plain to every unprejudiced reader how little the non-existence of the feasts can be inferred from the silence of subsequent books concerning them. On the notices occurring in later books, see hereafter. They who deny the Mosaic origin of the seasons of worship prescribed in the Pentateuch, have as yet entirely failed to show, as they are bound to do, where their origin is to be inserted in the subsequent history of Israel, and how it is to be explained. Besides, the whole cycle of sacred seasons, and especially the series of sabbatical periods, form a closely-connected and self-completing whole.

Digitized by Google

II. THE SABBATICAL SEASONS.

(*a*) THE WEEKLY SABBATH (1).

§ 147.

1. *Antiquity and Origin of the Sabbath.*

The word שַׁבָּת, which is mostly a feminine, was probably, as is shown by its form with suffixes (שַׁבַּתּוֹ), originally an abstract contracted from שַׁבְּתַת (rest, *ἀνάπαυσις*, Josephus, *Ant.* i. 1. 1) (2). The full expression is, however, יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת.

The Sabbath, which many regard as instituted in Paradise, and others derive, as the day of Saturn, from the oldest heathenism, viz. the Egyptian, is, according to the Pentateuch, of purely *Mosaic origin*. In Gen. ii. 1, indeed, the hallowing of the seventh day, but not the promulgation among men of a command to observe it, is connected with creation (3). In patriarchal times, too, we meet with no trace of the Sabbath; and accordingly find the Fathers, when opposing Judaism, emphatically insisting that the just before Moses obtained God's approbation although they did not keep the rest of the Sabbath (4). The first injunction to sanctify the Sabbath appears, Ex. xvi. 5, 22–30, on the occasion of the gathering of the manna, and indeed in a form which seems to indicate that the Sabbath was not then unknown to the people. It was not till they had been thus initiated in the celebration of the Sabbath, by experiencing the blessing resting upon it (5), that the special promulgation of the Sabbath command followed at Sinai. The expression used of the Sabbath, Ex. xx. 8, "*Remember*" (זָכוֹר), is not intended to recall the Sabbath to mind as an ancient institution, but requires the people to be from that time onward mindful of the Sabbath-day, and thus entirely corresponds with the "observe" (שָׁמוֹר) of the parallel passage, Deut. v. 12 (6). Neh. ix. 14 also testifies to the Mosaic origin of the Sabbath. To derive

Digitized by Google

the Sabbath from *heathenism* is decidedly opposed to the *Old Testament*, which declares the Sabbath to be a *sign* between Jehovah and His people, whose part it is to acknowledge that the Lord has consecrated Israel to be His people (Ex. xxxi. 13; Ezek. xx. 12) (7). Neither can this derivation be supported by the history of religion (8). It is true that the notion of sacredness of the *number seven* was very widely diffused in antiquity; but this may be sufficiently explained by its frequent and significant occurrence in natural events, especially in the planetary system of the ancients and the course of the moon (9). The *cycle of the week*, too, which was perhaps originally formed as the quarter of the synodic lunar month (so Hengstenberg), though not perfectly corresponding thereto, reaches back to pre-Mosaic times (see Gen. xxix. 27 sq., and perhaps even vii. 4, 10, viii. 10, 12, xvii. 12, xxi. 4) (10). Still the week of seven days was by no means universally diffused in antiquity: the ancient Egyptians especially, to whom Dio Cassius, xxxvii. 18 sq. (11), refers the seven days week, previously used, according to recent investigations (12), a ten-days division of time. At all events, it is certain that a *religious consecration* of the seventh day of the week, or even of any one of the seven week-days, cannot be shown to have prevailed in any of the heathen religions (13). The customary combination of the Jewish Sabbath with the *day of Saturn* in Greek and Roman authors (14), rests upon the reference of the seven days of the week to *the planets*. Of this the Old Testament knows nothing; and even in heathenism the notion does not seem of very great antiquity (15). Its general diffusion, says Dio Cassius, *idem*, is not yet old (16),—the passage in Herodotus, ii. 82, which informs us that among the Egyptians every month and day was sacred to some god, having reference to the days not (as is now proved) of the week but of the month, each of the thirty days of the month having its special tutelar divinity. The oldest testimony for the practice in question is the oracular saying in Eusebius, *præp. ev.* 5. 14, where the invocation of the

Digitized by Google

seven planets on their seven days is referred to the magician Ostanes, who was, according to Pliny, *hist. nat.* 30. 2, a contemporary of Xerxes. That succession of the planets, on which the naming of the days of the week is founded, rests, moreover, according to the above-cited passage of Dio Cassius (see on this matter Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, p. 941 sqq.), upon artificial theories, one of which assumes a division of the day into 24 hours (17). Even on this account it is a doubtful proceeding to attribute (as Baur does) to the identification of the Sabbath with Saturn's day the weight of a very ancient tradition. The association of ideas, however, which led to this combination may easily be perceived (18). The idea of an easy and happy life was so closely connected with the idea of Saturn (Hesiod, *op. et d.* 170; Pindar, *Ol.* 2. 70 sq.), that ὁ ἐπὶ Κρόνου βίος (Lucian. *fugit.* 17) just signified a lazy life (19). With the Romans, too, it was natural to compare the Jewish Sabbath, with its leisure, and as being the day on which, as Tacitus (*hist.* v. 4, comp. Justin, *hist.* 36. 2) states the matter, their labours were once brought to an end by their deliverance from Egypt, with their own Saturnalia (20). No Roman or Grecian author, however, knows anything of any heathen celebration of the seventh day of the week. Such a celebration is, on the contrary, regarded by Roman authors as something specifically Jewish, and therefore as a fit subject of scorn for the satirists (21); Seneca, *e.g.*, considering that to keep the Sabbath was "*septimam fere partem ætatis perdere.*" When Josephus and Philo speak of a general diffusion of the rest of the Sabbath, this must be referred to the ever increasing imitation of Jewish customs prevailing in those centuries (22); for the leisure of the seventh day was not only grateful to proselytes to Judaism, but was also adopted by the heathen (23), especially after the day of Saturn (of the "sidus triste," Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 569) was, in consequence of the introduction of eastern astrology, regarded as a *dies ater*, and consequently as unfavourable to any undertaking, especially to a journey (Tibull. i. 3. 18).

Digitized by Google

(1) Compare my article *Sabbath* in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* xiii. p. 193 sq. {Cf. also Lagarde, *Psalterium Hieronymi*, 1874, p. 158 ff.; Schrader in *Stud. und Krit.* 1874, p. 343 ff.; Chwolsohn, *SSabier und Ssabismus*, vol. ii. p. 173 f.}

(2) According to another view (so Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrb.* § 155 *c*), the word is said to be originally a masculine after the form קָטֹל, and to designate the day itself as the celebrator. The mode of expression, however, in several passages (*e.g.* Ex. xxxi. 15, "on the seventh day is שַׁבָּת") does not agree with this notion. (Compare also Böttcher, *Ausf. Lehrb.* § 621. 4, with note 2.) The view according to which שַׁבָּת is said to be contracted from שַׁבְעָת (= ἑβδομάς, an expression which is certainly sometimes placed for the Sabbath, 2 Macc. vi. 11, xii. 38, etc.), and to denote the seventh day (Lact. *inst.* 7. 14: *dies sabbati, qui lingua Hebræorum a numero nomen accepit*), rests on no better foundation than does the combination of the root שָׁבַת with שׁוּב by Bähr, *Symbolik des mos. Kultus*, ii. p. 532 sq. On the contemptuous explanation of this word in Apion, see Josephus in his work against the latter (ii. 2). The LXX., New Testament, Josephus, and others render the word not merely by τὸ *σάββατον*, but also by τὰ *σάββατα*; the latter plural form with a singular meaning might be an imitation of the Aramean form of the *stat. emph.*, but is probably to be explained by the analogy of the names of other sacred seasons, as *ἐγκαίνια*, *ἄζυμα*. Comp. Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachidioms*, p. 21; the same, on the metaplasm in the declension of this plural.

(3) So also the prevailing Jewish interpretation understands the words as כתוב על־העתיד (Raschi *in loco*). An allusion to the Sabbath could only be discovered in Gen. iv. 3 by an incorrect explanation of מִקֵּץ יָמִים.

(4) Justinus M. *dial. c. Tryph.* cap. 19. 27; Irenæus, *adv. haer.* iv. 16. 2; Eusebius, *hist. eccl.* i. 4.

(5) See in Selden, *de jure nat. et gent.* iii. 11, what the Jews further say concerning this שבת ראשונה. The opposite view is advocated by Saalschütz, *das mos. Recht*, p. 389 sq.

(6) Gerhard, *loc. th. ed. Cott.* v. p. 311, rightly says, *admonemur hac voce, quod ad præceptorum divinorum observantiam requiratur animus* memor *et vigilans.*

(7) So even the Jews themselves regard the Sabbath as an

Digitized by Google

ordinance specifically their own. See Selden, *idem*, iii. 10; hence in the synagogue worship the Sabbath is greeted as a bride (comp. Buxtorf, *synag. jud.* p. 299).

(8) See Baur, *der hebräische Sabbath und die Nationalfeste des mosaischen Kultus, Tübinger Zeitschr.* 1832, No. 3, p. 125 sq. In modern works, and especially in Oschwald's *Die christliche Sonntagsfeier*, 1850, p. 13 sq., a great abuse has been committed with unproved traditionary religious tenets. The purpose of this work is to obtain an historical foundation for the opinion that the Sabbath was not abrogated with the ceremonial law, by asserting its pre-Mosaic and extra-Mosaic existence. It is worthy of notice how a one-sided Nomism here allies itself with certain hypotheses of the history of religion which subserve a totally different interest. Far more prudently has the matter in question been treated by Liebetrut in his work, *Die Sonntagsfeier das Wochenfest des Volkes Gottes*, 1851.

(9) Comp. Philo, *de mundi opif.* ed. Mang. i. p. 24; Plutarch, *de Ei ap. Delph.* cap. 17.

(10) It seems to have been an ancient property of the Semitic nations, and probably was transferred from them to others, though it might have originated independently in different places.

(11) Dio Cassius, xxxvii. 18 sq.: "The division of days, according to the seven so-called planets, began with the Egyptians, and has been, but not, I believe, very long, adopted by all nations. The ancient Greeks, so far as I know, were unacquainted with it. It is now, however, customary among all people, and even among the Romans, and has become to a certain extent indigenous," etc.

(12) See Lepsius, *Chronol. der Aegypter*, i. p. 22. Brugsch in the *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* iii. p. 271.

(13) Especially not among the Egyptians, not even, indeed, according to the passage of Dio Cassius cited above, the subject of which is the merely astrological import of the seven days of the week, and by no means the special sacredness of one of them. Nor among the Arabs; for though, clothed in black, they sacrificed an ox to Saturn on his day in a hexagonal black temple, the reason was not that the seventh day was hallowed by them, but that Saturn was feared as the evil

Digitized by Google

power, the planet Jupiter being also worshipped by them on his day by the sacrifice of a hog (see Stühr, *Religionssyst. des Orients*, p. 407). Nor even among the Greeks; for though Oschwald, *id.* (comp. v. Bohlen, *altes Indien*, ii. p. 245; Baur, *id.* p. 135 sq.), asserts that in Grecian literature, and even so early as Homer and Hesiod, we meet with decided testimony to the sacredness of the seventh day, this can only refer, so far as a proof of an analogy with the Sabbath is concerned, to those verses quoted by Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 14; Eusebius, *Præp. ev.* xiii. 12, which are confessedly of Græco-Jewish fabrication. Hesiod himself speaks, *op. et d.* ver. 770 sq., of the seventh day of the month as sacred to Apollo, and of other days of the month as appropriated to other deities. (See Hermann, *gottesdienstl. Alterth. der Griechen*, § 44, note 5; Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, p. 430 sqq.) Finally, the Roman calendar had, as is known, absolutely nothing to do with the weekly cycle and the consecration of the seventh day of the week; its feast of Saturn took place but once a year, in December (generally on the 19th), and lasted, after the era of Augustus for three, after that of Caligula for five days. (When seven days were reckoned, as Martial. 14. 72, Lucian. *epist. Saturn.* 25, other festivals were included.)

(14) A combination subsequently adopted by the Rabbinists, inasmuch as they call the planet Saturn שַׁבְּתַי.

(15) Comp. Ewald, *Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenl.* iii. p. 417.

(16) For a summary of the evidence that the several week-days were called after the planets, see Selden, *idem*, iii. 19.

(17) The matter is as follows: In the combination of the seven planets of the ancients with the seven days of the week, Saturn is not the last, but the first; and the succession, as existing in our days of the week, arose thus. The order of the planets is—Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, the Moon. Every hour of the day was dedicated to a planet. If, then, the first hour of the first day of the week was sacred to Saturn, so also were the eighth, the fifteenth, and the twenty-second; the twenty-third, on the other hand, belonged to Jupiter, the twenty-fourth to Mars, the twenty-fifth, or the first hour of the second day, to the Sun; hence the Sunday followed the Saturday. The first hour, then, of Sunday being

Digitized by Google

sacred to the Sun, the twenty-third was awarded to Venus, the twenty-fourth to Mercury, and therefore the first hour of the following day to the Moon; hence Monday succeeds Sunday. On Monday the twenty-third hour fell to Saturn, the twenty-fourth to Jupiter, and the first hour of the next day to Mars; hence Mars' day, our Tuesday, succeeds Monday, etc.

(18) Dio Cassius alludes to this when he brings forward, as a peculiarity of the Jewish Sabbath, the *οὐδὲν τὸ παράπαν δρᾶν* (cap. 16), the *ἔργου οὐδενὸς σπουδαίου προσάπτεσθαι* (cap. 17).

(19) On the *torpor Saturni*, comp. Servius on Virgil, *Æn.* vi. 714).

(20) When even Tacitus, *idem*, vindicates the combination of the Sabbath with Saturn's day,—according to some, by confounding the *Idæi* of Crete with the *Judæi* (Jews); according to others, by appealing to the dignity of Saturn as the chief of the planets ("*alii, honorem eum Saturno haberi, seu principia religionis tradentibus Idæis, quos cum Saturno pulsos et conditores gentis accepimus, seu quod e septem sideribus, quis mortales reguntur, altissimo orbe et præcipua potentia stella Saturni feratur*"),—this very passage plainly shows that we have here mere hypotheses, to which no more value is to be attributed than to the combination reported by Plutarch (*Sympos.* iv. 6), and also mentioned by Tacitus, of the worship of Jehovah with the service of Bacchus, which, according to Plutarch, even brings the word Sabbath into connection with the *σαβοί* (the designation of the Bacchantes).

(21) Comp. Ovid, *de art. amat.* i. 415 sq.; Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 96–106; Persius, v. 179–184; Martialis, iv. 4, 7. The saying of Tacitus, "*Moses, quo sibi in posterum gentem firmaret,* novos *ritus* contrariosque *ceteris mortalibus indidit,*" refers, as appears from the context, among other things to the celebration of the Sabbath.

(22) Josephus, in the frequently misunderstood passage, *c. Ap.* ii. 39, says: "There is no city, whether Greek or barbarian, and no single nation, to which the custom of the seventh day, which we celebrate by intermission of labour, has not penetrated." As appears from the connection of the whole passage, this rhetorical exaggeration by no means speaks of an institution akin to the Sabbath as having existed from of old among the heathen. It is true that Philo also declares

Digitized by Google

(*de opif. mundi*, M. i. p. 21) the Sabbath to be, according to its *intention*, an ἑορτὴ τοῦ παντός, a μόνη πάνδημος καὶ τοῦ κόσμου γενέθλιος; but what he says concerning its diffusion, when his hyperboles are reduced to their due proportion, testifies to nothing more than Seneca complains of, when, in the well-known words in Augustin, *civ. dei*, vi. 11 (Seneca, *opp. ed. Hase*, iii. p. 427), he laments the mimicry of Jewish customs: "*usque eo sceleratissimæ gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes jam terras recepta sit; victi victoribus leges dederunt.*"

(23) Comp. how Tertullian, *Apol.* cap. 16, speaks of heathen *qui diem Saturni otio et victui decernunt, exorbitantes et ipsi a Judaico more, quem ignorant, i.e.* because they are unacquainted with the religious meaning of the Sabbath.

§ 148.

2. *The Idea of the Sabbath.*

In conformity with what has already been advanced, the import of the Sabbath is to be discerned from the Old Testament alone. The chief passages relating to it are Gen. ii. 3, Ex. xx. 11, xxxi. 13–17, the essential matter of which is as follows:—God created the world in six days, and rested on the seventh, and therefore blessed and hallowed this day, on which His work was complete. Hence the people whom He has consecrated to Himself, and who acknowledge the Creator and Lord of the world as their God, are also to hallow the seventh day as a day of rest after every six days' labour in the works of their calling, and this is to be a sign of the covenant between God and His people. These propositions contain the following thoughts: 1. Man, like God, is to work and to rest; thus human life is to be a copy of Divine life. But especially must the people who are called to be the instrument of restoring the Divine order in earthly life be seen to be the peculiar possession of the living God, by an alternation of work and rest corresponding with the rhythm of the Divine life. 2. Divine labour terminates in happy rest; not till the Creator rests

Digitized by Google

satisfied in the contemplation of His works is His creation itself complete (1). So, too, human labour is not to run on in resultless circles, but to terminate in a happy harmony of existence. This thought, as we shall see hereafter (§ 152), is impressed with especial clearness on the institution of the year of jubilee with which the sabbatic seasons close. The idea of the Sabbath, however, extends further. That the whole course of human history is not to run on in dreary endlessness; that its events are to have a positive termination; are to find a completion in an harmonious and God-given order,—is already guaranteed by the Sabbath of creation, and prefigured by the sabbatical seasons. The Divine rest of the seventh day of creation, which has no evening, hovers over the world's progress, that it may at last absorb it into itself. It is upon the very fact that the rest *of God*, the *κατάπαυσις Θεοῦ*, is also to be a rest *for man*, and that God has declared this by the institution of the Sabbath, that Heb. iv. founds a proof for the proposition: *ἄρα ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ* (ver. 9) (2). This idea of the Sabbath finds its formal expression in the *number seven*, this number frequently appearing in natural occurrences as *ἀριθμὸς τελεσφόρος* and *ἀποκαταστατικός*, as Philo calls it (3). It thus became the sign-manual of the perfection in which the progress of the world was, according to Divine charter, to result, and a special pledge of the perfection of the kingdom of God (4).

The full purport, however, of the sabbatic idea is not attained until that dominion of *sin and death*, which have entered into the development of mankind, is taken into account. It was after the curse of God was imposed upon the earth, and man condemned to labour in the sweat of his brow in the service of his perishable existence, that the desire for the rest of God took the form of a longing for *redemption* (Gen. v. 29). Israel, too, learned, by suffering under Egyptian oppression without any refreshing intermission, to sigh for rest. When their God bestowed upon them their regularly recurring period

Digitized by Google

of rest, by leading them out of bondage, this ordinance became at the same time *a thankful solemnity in remembrance of the deliverance they had experienced.* Hence it is said, in the second version of the Decalogue (Deut. v. 15): "Remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, with a mighty hand and a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day." This passage does not, as it has often been understood, merely urge a motive to the special obligation of not hindering servants from resting on the seventh day; nor, on the other hand, does it contain, as has also been asserted, the proper objective reason for the sanctification of the Sabbath, which is, on the contrary, expressed, as already said, in the first version of the Decalogue, Ex. xx. 11: but it applies to the keeping of the Sabbath, in particular, that consideration which is the deepest subjective incitement to the fulfilling of the whole law (5). How closely the remembrance of the deliverance from Egyptian bondage was bound up with this very institution of the Sabbath, is evident from what, according to the testimony of Roman authors given above (Tacitus, *hist.* v. 4; Justin, *hist.* 36. 2), was known to the heathen concerning the reason for the celebration of the Sabbath.

We have thus explained how the Sabbath teaches to look *upwards, onwards,* and *backwards;* but one point, important in an ethic aspect, remains to be noticed. The Sabbath has its significance only as the seventh day, preceded by six days of labour. The first part of the command, Ex. xx. 9, to hallow the Sabbath, is itself equally a command: "Six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God" (6). Thus it is only upon the foundation of preceding labour in our vocation that the rest of the Sabbath is to be reared. The saying, Gen. iii. 19, "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread," remains in force. The Sabbath is only intended to prevent self-exhaustion in earthly labour (7), and to sanctify the works of our

Digitized by Google

calling by the end towards which they tend. The impression of the humane character of the Mosaic law upon the ordinance of the Sabbath, especially in the benefits it confers upon the menials, the strangers dwelling in the midst of Israel, and the beasts of draught and burden (Ex. xx. 10, xxiii. 12), and the social advantages it confers, cannot be further dwelt on here (8).

(1) Comp. § 18, and the remarks on Gen. ii. 2 in note 1 to § 52.

(2) This, as is well known, was already further explained by the ancient Church of the seventh of those centuries during which the world was to continue its course, and which was to be its sabbatic consummation (see especially Lactantius, *Inst.* vii. 14).

(3) Comp. Baur, *id.*, and Philo, *de mundi opif.* M. i. p. 24, *de septenario*, M. ii. p. 281. Philo's mysticism of numbers is founded upon the circumstance that seven is that number in the decade which is not produced, and which, within the decade, does not produce. Thus seven becomes the symbol of the immutable, the complete. However little weight we may attribute to this, it is at all events remarkable that a certain importance of the number seven gleams through in one way or other in each of the more developed religions of antiquity.

(4) The view brought forward, chiefly by Bähr (*Symbolik des mos. Kultus*, i. p. 187), that three is the signature of Godhead, four that of the world, seven as the number in which three and four meet and combine in one number, *the signature of the connection of God and the world*, is not tenable. Comp. on this point, besides what is quoted § 145, note 1, Lämmert, *Zur Revision der biblischen Zahlensymbolik*, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1864, No. 1. He says, p. 7: "As often as seven recurs in the enumeration of sections of time, there is a period of sacred rest, a time of the Lord, when the earthly day-work is set aside,—a type of the consummation which will take place in *that* sabbatic rest which remaineth to the people of God."

(5) Deut. v. 15 bears the same relation to Ex. xx. 11 as does *e.g.* Deut. xxvi. 8 sq. to previous laws concerning the offering of the first-fruits.

Digitized by Google

(6) It is not correct to say, with Hengstenberg, that the chief matter with respect to the Sabbath is not that it is exactly the seventh day, but that it is the weekly recurring rest day of the people. The sabbatic seasons are closing periods. The idea of Sunday is quite different.

(7) Keil, *Bibl. Archäol.* i. p. 362: "As a corrective of the injury arising from that severe and burdensome labour, the result of the curse, which tends to alienate man from God."

(8) It was remarked, § 12, what good service has been done in these respects, especially by J. D. Michaelis. The Old Testament sabbatic ordinances have in this respect found an eloquent eulogist in Proudhon, the communist (*Die Sonntagsfeier, betrachtet in Hinsicht auf öffentliche Gesundheit, Moral, Familien- und Bürgerleben;* aus dem Französischen, Ratibor, 1850). The bringing forward of such utilitarian considerations is not on the whole unjustifiable, if they are stated as merely secondary, and are freely deducible from the principle; but only total misconception or gross perversion of the ideal value of the Mosaic law can characterize them as the proper explanation and motive of the Mosaic ordinances.

§ 149.

3. *The Celebration of the Sabbath.*

According to the foregoing remarks, the Sabbath is a Divine institution (1), or, to speak more correctly, a gift of Divine grace for the sanctification of the people (Ezek. xx. 12) (2). In other words, the Sabbath is first of all of a *sacramental* nature. The Divine gift must indeed be met by a corresponding and commanded conduct or sacrifice on the part of the people, and thus a *sacrificial* is added to the sacramental element. If the former, however, is placed in the foreground, as by Ewald (*Alterthümer*, 1st ed. p. 104 sqq., 3d ed. p. 130 sqq.), who views the Sabbath as a sacrifice of rest, or if the sabbatic abstinence from labour is, as a cessation from business and a renunciation of gain, even placed on a level with fasting, as by Knobel (on Lev. xxiii.), we have in either case a thorough misconception of

Digitized by Google

the Old Testament view. In this, far from presenting any painful aspect of renunciation, the Sabbath is regarded as a delight (Isa. lviii. 13), *a day of joy* (compare the song for the Sabbath, Ps. xcii. and Hos. ii. 13) (3).

It is in this sense that we must regard the enactments with respect to the *celebration* of the Sabbath. The first point is *the resting from labour* (4), to which belongs not merely the intermission of servile work (field work even in the seasons of ploughing and harvest, Ex. xxxiv. 21; gathering wood, Num. xv. 32), but also, Ex. xvi. 23, omission of the preparation of food,—the prohibition to kindle fire in their dwellings, xxxv. 3, referring without doubt to the latter. The Israelites were also forbidden to go out of the camp, xvi. 19, on the Sabbath, whence the prohibition of travelling on this day subsequently arose. Capital punishment, xxxi. 14, xxxv. 2, viz. by stoning, Num. xv. 35 sq., was attached to the transgression of these enactments, as it was to that of all the fundamental laws of the theocracy. It was quite in harmony with these appointments of the law, that the bearing of burdens, Jer. xvii. 21, and trading, Amos viii. 5 sq., were declared incompatible with the Sabbath, and that Nehemiah ordered a barring of the gates, Neh. xiii. 15, 19, to prevent the trading whose discontinuance had, according to x. 31, been promised. The *positive* celebration of the Sabbath arose from its appointment for worship. Besides the consecration it received from the doubling of the morning and evening sacrifices (Num. xxviii. 9), and the renewal of the shew-bread (Lev. xxiv. 8), a holy convocation, מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ, also took place on this day (see § 146. 3). As it was only possible for a small portion of the people to visit the central sanctuary, meetings for hearing and meditating on the Divine word may have taken place in very early times, but the first trace of such assemblies is found in 2 Kings iv. 23 (5). Greater prominence is unmistakeably given in the law to the negative than to the positive side of Sabbath sanctification; and it is totally incorrect to assert that the cessation from labour

Digitized by Google

enjoined on the Sabbath was merely a *means*, the end being public worship (6). It is worthy of remark that those later prophetic passages which insist on the sanctification of the Sabbath, such as Isa. lvi. 2, lviii. 13 sq., Jer. xvii. 21 sqq., confine themselves to declaring what ought *not* to be done on the Sabbath, Isa. lviii. 13 proscribing also such unprofitable idleness as empty gossip. Are we then to conclude that that positive sanctification of the Sabbath, which consists in public worship, was less intended by the law? Such a notion is opposed by the whole above described development of the Sabbath idea. Rather do we perceive here also that wise pædagogy on the part of the law, which does not expressly command much, because it leaves much to be the spontaneous result of the given facts, types, and ordinances (comp. § 84). Such a pædagogy, from negative to positive, from the external to the internal, was latent also in the legal prescriptions concerning the rest of the Sabbath. Besides ensuring that recreation which is, as we have said, their proper aim, they go as far as is needful in preparing the ground for a positive sanctification of the day, the motives for which are thus implanted in the nation's heart (7); while the enactments, on the contrary, with which later Judaism encompassed the sabbatic command, were wholly adapted to repress a cheerful celebration of the Sabbath (8).

(1) Compare what is remarked, § 145, on the general character of Old Testament seasons of worship.

(2) Ezek. xx. 12: "I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that it might be known that I, Jehovah, sanctify them."

(3) At their first celebration of the Sabbath, the people received a substantial pledge of the blessing with which its faithful observance would be rewarded, and of the bountiful compensation contemplated for what was lost by cessation from labour (Ex. xvi. 29).

(4) See § 146. 2, and the particulars there given on the distinction between the weekly and festival Sabbaths.

Digitized by Google

(5) See on these passages, the discussion on the schools of the prophets in the history of the kingdom of the ten tribes. It need scarcely be remarked that the observance of the Sabbath, as subsequently practised in the synagogues, cannot be relegated, as by Josephus (*c. Ap.* ii. 17), to ancient times.

(6) So *e.g.* Hengstenberg. Vitringa, *de synag. vet.* p. 292 sq., is quite right in his opposition to such opinions.

(7) Comp. Vitringa, *id.* p. 295.

(8) These enactments were made in the centuries between Ezra and Christ. On the importance attained during the captivity by the ordinance of the Sabbath as one of those portions of the ceremonial law which could be practised by the Jews scattered among the heathen, comp. *Prophetism.* The above-quoted passages, however, of the book of Nehemiah, especially x. 32, according to which the people had to bind themselves by oath to give up trading on the Sabbath, show that in his days a strict observance of the Sabbath had not as yet become a national custom. There is, moreover, in the measures taken by Nehemiah for the preservation of the sabbatic rest, nothing of the micrologic casuistry of after times. On the scrupulosity with which the Sabbath was observed in the times of the Maccabees, see the above-cited article, p. 290, where will also be found, p. 201 sqq., a collection of the most important enactments of later Judaism.

(*b*) THE NEW MOON SABBATH.

§ 150.

By the term *new moon*, according to the sense in which the law uses it, we must undoubtedly understand, not the astronomical new moon, but the *first appearance of the moon's sickle*, which was thus designated by other ancient nations also, and certainly by the Jews of later date (1). The ordinary new moons were only subordinate festivals, on which (Num. xxviii. 11–15) an increased burnt-offering was offered, accompanied, as appears from x. 10, by a blowing of trumpets. They were

Digitized by Google

chiefly used, as may be conjectured from 1 Sam. xx. 5 sq., for family sacrifices. Labour was not forbidden on these days; but in later times, as may be inferred from Amos viii. 5, their stricter celebration seems to have been enacted, at least in the kingdom of the ten tribes. The *seventh new moon*, viz. that of the month Tisri in autumn, on the contrary, was a sabbatic day. Its proper name, יוֹם תְּרוּעָה, the day of trumpet-sounding, seems to indicate that the use of trumpets in public worship took place with special solemnity on this day. *The meaning of the blowing of trumpets* is evident from Num. x. 9 sq.: "If ye go to war, . . . ye shall blow an alarm with the trumpets, and ye shall be remembered before the Lord. . . . Also in the days of your gladness, your solemn days or new moons, ye shall blow with trumpets at your burnt-offerings and at your peace-offerings, for a memorial before your God" (לְזִכָּרוֹן לִפְנֵי אֱלֹהֵיכֶם). According to this, the sounding of trumpets at worship took the place, as it were, of an invocation: it was to bring the people to God's remembrance, or rather to bring the people to the consciousness that God was thinking of them. Hence we subsequently find that, when after the time of David singing was introduced into public worship, the intervention of trumpet-sounding by the priests at specially marked passages helped, so to speak, to bear the supplications of the people upwards to the Lord (comp. 2 Chron. xiii. 14) (2). Whether, however, the sounding of trumpets at the seventh new moon was meant to indicate in a general manner that this was an intensified Sabbath, or whether (as Sommer thinks) this act had a reference to the Day of Atonement which closely followed, and was intended, as it were, to remind God of the approaching act of grace, of the renewed forgiveness of the sins of the people, cannot be determined. The feast of the new year was not yet a day celebrated in the Mosaic worship, though the precept, Ex. xii. 2, that the month in which Israel departed from Egypt (that of Abib or Nisan in spring) was to be the first month of the year, seems to indicate that the year had previously com-

Digitized by Google

menced at another period (3); and passages such as Ex. xxiii. 16 presuppose an agricultural year beginning in autumn, which probably, however, had no appointed boundaries (4).

(1) On the approach of the new moon, the Sanhedrim assembled at Jerusalem to receive from him who had first seen the sickle of the moon, the information, which was then transmitted by signals throughout the country.

(2) To this purpose I refer, with Sommer (comp. his *bibl. Abhandl.* i. p. 37 sq.), Keil, and others, the difficult סֶלָה.

(3) Comp. also what is said on the narrative of the deluge in the commentaries on Genesis of Knobel, p. 74, and Delitzsch, ed. 2, p. 250 sq., ed. 4, p. 213 sq.

(4) See also Ex. xxxiv. 22, and finally the appointment concerning the commencement of the year of jubilee, Lev. xxv. 9, together with the fact that the sabbatic year must also naturally have begun at seed-time, *i.e.* in harvest (comp. xxv. 4). According to Josephus, *Ant.* i. 3. 3, the beginning of the year with Tisri was of pre-Mosaic institution; and this date was preserved by Moses for the transaction of civil business. But whatever might have been the case with regard to the pre-Mosaic year, the above-quoted passages from the middle books of the Pentateuch do not point to the 1st Tisri as the beginning of the civil year. For it is unnatural to suppose that, on the assumption of such a date of commencement, it could be said of the Feast of Tabernacles, which was celebrated from the 15th to the 21st Tisri, that it fell in the end of the year; nor are the remarks of Hupfeld (*De primitiva et vera fest. ap. Hebr. ratione*, ii. p. 14), in favour of such a view, of much avail. Far preferable is the view of Hitzig (*Komm. zu Jesaja*, p. 335), that if the beginning of the agricultural year (for the so-called social year is more correctly designated thus) was bound to an appointed day, still for ordinary affairs the commencement of the year dated from the close of the Feast of Tabernacles (article *Feste der späteren Juden*). On the subject of the new moon Sabbath becoming the civil new year's festival, as it still is among the Jews, see the history of the post-Babylonian period.

Digitized by Google

(*c*) THE SABBATIC YEAR AND YEAR OF JUBILEE (1).

§ 151.

Legal Enactments.

The institutions of the *sabbatic year* and the *year of jubilee*, with which the cycle of sabbatic seasons closed, are so closely connected, that it will be convenient to consider them together. The laws relating to the *sabbatic year* are as follow:—*First*, the general command, Ex. xxiii. 10 sq., that after the land had been sown and its harvests gathered in during six successive years, it should rest and lie still (תִּשְׁמְטֶנָּה) (2), that *the poor* might eat of it, and that what they left the beasts of the field might eat. In like manner, too, were the vineyards and olive-yards to be dealt with. *Care for the poor* is, as the connection with what precedes shows (3), the point of view under which the Sabbath is here chiefly regarded. The *second* and more detailed law, Lev. xxv. 1–7, more precisely designates this ordinance as a rest of the *land* (vers. 2, 4) unto the Lord, calls the year a sabbath year (שְׁנַת שַׁבָּתוֹן), and further appoints that what the fields and vineyards produced in this year without cultivation should not be stored up but consumed by the owner, his family, his day-labourers, and the strangers sojourning with him; his cattle, and the wild animals of the land (4). The point of view here adduced is that the produce of the sabbatic year was to be *common property* for man and beast (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 12. 3),—a point of view which does not exclude but include that brought forward in the first law. With the great fertility of the soil of Palestine, which is still apparent (5) in its self-sown, wild-growing wheat, the growth (סְפִיחַ) from the fallen seeds of the preceding year might yield a not inconsiderable crop (6). An essentially new enactment is contained in the *third* law, Deut. xv. 1–11. The connection of vers. 1–6 with xiv. 29, and with what follows in xv. 7–10,

Digitized by Google

recalls the connection of the first law in the book of the covenant, the question being here, as there, the special import of the sabbatic year to *the poor*. For in the seventh year every creditor was to release (שָׁמַט) the loan he had lent to his neighbour (7). Of his neighbour or of his brother, in contradistinction to a foreigner, ver. 5, he was not to exact, because a release (שְׁמִטָּה) had been proclaimed, to the honour of the Lord; whence the sabbath year is also called, ver. 9 (comp. xxxi. 10), שְׁנַת הַשְּׁמִטָּה, the year of release. The question whether by release we are to understand a final remission or a temporary suspension, has been variously answered. The former is the ordinary Jewish view (8), though subsequent enactments contrived the means of evading the command (9). Many Christian theologians have also shared in the rabbinic view, especially Luther. The expressions, however, in vers. 2 and 3 go no further than to say that debts are not to be exacted, and therefore point merely to their suspension (10). The *fourth* law respecting the sabbath year, Deut. xxxi. 10-13, enjoins that at the Feast of Tabernacles in the year of release, the law should be read in the public assembly of the people in the sanctuary. The sabbath year being regulated by agriculture, and beginning with the omission of sowing in autumn, or being more definitely connected with a certain day, as the year of jubilee was with the 10th Tisri (11), this Feast of Tabernacles would be at its commencement (12). Hence a significant hint is given by this precept as to how the seventh year just entered upon ought to be hallowed.

Seven such sabbatic years terminated with *the year of jubilee* (שְׁנַת הַיּוֹבֵל). With respect to this it is said, Lev. xxv. 8, 10: "Seven sabbaths of years shalt thou number, seven years seven times, that the days of the seven sabbaths of years may be forty-nine years. . . . And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year." This very variously-explained passage is most naturally understood as declaring that the year of jubilee is to follow the seventh sabbatic year,—not, indeed (as some have considered), as the

Digitized by Google

first year of a new period of sabbatic years, but so that the new period should not commence till the fifty-first year. This view of the matter appears to be assumed by both Philo and Josephus (13). And thus also does the controverted passage xxv. 20–22, which then refers to the year of jubilee spoken of immediately before, and assumes two consecutive fallow years, find it most natural explanation. According to another view, the year of jubilee was, on the contrary, the forty-ninth, and, as the sabbath of sabbath years, coincided with every seventh of the latter (14). It is thus generally assumed that the sabbatic year began in spring; and the designation of the year of jubilee as the fiftieth is explained by saying that the latter, not commencing till harvest, was composed of the second half of the seventh year and the first half of the first year of a new sabbatic period (15). This latter theory cannot appeal with certainty to Jewish tradition. For the notion of R. Jehuda (*Erachin*, fol. 12 *b*), that the year of jubilee as a whole was never reckoned as a separate year, is an isolated one,—the tradition of the Geonim (in Maimonides, *de juribus anni septimi et jubilæi*, x. 4) only asserting that the year of jubilee fell into desuetude after the destruction of the first temple.

According to Lev. xxv. 9, the year of jubilee was to be proclaimed by the sound of a trumpet (שׁוֹפַר תְּרוּעָה) throughout the whole land (by means of messengers), on the tenth day of the seventh month, that is, on the Day of Atonement, after all the transgressions resting upon the people had been expiated. It was from the sound of this trumpet (Raschi, על שם תקיעת שופר) that the year, according to the most widely-accepted view, took its name. In this case יוֹבֵל must probably be explained as derived from יָבַל, to flow abundantly, and used to designate the sound flowing or bursting forth from the trumpet,—a sense which well agrees with the expression מָשַׁךְ הַיּוֹבֵל, Ex. xix. 13, and מָשַׁךְ בֶּקֶרֶן הַיּוֹבֵל, Josh. vi. 5. Others regard it as an onomatopoetic word, in the sense of *jubilavit* (comp. Gesenius, *Thes.* ii. p. 561); thus the Vulgate renders: *Annus*

Digitized by Google

jubilei or *jubileus*. On the other hand, a rabbinic tradition (see Abèn Ezra on Lev. xxv. 10) makes יוֹבֵל = יְשִׁלּוּחַ, *emissus*, and designate a ram, and then a ram's horn. This substantival explanation is in any case incorrect, while the grammatical notion on which it is founded is, on the contrary, admissible. יוֹבֵל would then, with דְּרוֹר, free course, denote first him who is free to go where he will, and then attain the abstract meaning of דְּרוֹר itself (see Hitzig on Jer. xxxiv. 8), which agrees well with Lev. xxv. 10 (16).

With regard to the celebration of the year of jubilee, we notice first the feature which it had in common with the sabbatic year, *of a cessation from agricultural labour*, Lev. xxv. 11 sq. The produce of what grew of itself was not to be stored up, but brought in from the field as required for use (17). The feature peculiar to the year of jubilee is contained, ver. 10, in the words, "Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty (דְּרוֹר) throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you, that ye may return every man to his possession, and every man to his family." In this year, called hence, Ex. xlvi. 17, שְׁנַת דְּרוֹר (which may be briefly translated, as by Luther, the free year), there took place, as it were, a new birth of the state, at which all such civil impediments as were opposed to theocratic principles were abolished. One of these was the bondage of Israelite citizens (18). Hence every Israelite who had sold himself on account of his poverty was to be freed (19). Another consisted in the alienation of hereditary estates, which might not therefore extend beyond the year of jubilee, in which all property was to return without compensation to the family to whom it originally belonged (*i.e.* to the original possessors, if still alive, or to their heirs), ver. 23 sq. (20). Houses in unwalled villages were (ver. 31) treated in the same manner as landed property, while houses in walled towns, on the contrary, if unredeemed during the year of respite after their sale, remained the property of their purchasers, the year of jubilee making no alteration in

Digitized by Google

this respect, ver. 29 sq. The reason for this distinction is easily perceived. Houses of the former kind were closely connected with landed property (ver. 13, they shall be counted to the field of the country), while houses in towns, on the other hand, stood in no relation to the land, and hence, as mere human works and property, were not equally under the sovereignty of Jehovah as Lord of the land (21).

(1) Comp. Hupfeld, *de primitiva et vera temp. fest. ap. Hebr. ratione*, iii. Hal. 1858, and my article on the sabbatic and jubilee years in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* xiii. p. 204 sq. A list of the numerous monographs on this subject is given by Winer in the *bibl. Realwörterbuch* under the articles *Sabbath Year* and *Year of Jubilee*. The chief works of later date are Hug's treatise, *über das mosaische Gesetz vom Jubeljahr*, in the *Zeitschr. für das Erzbisthum Freiburg*, i. 1, and the prize essays at the Jubilee of the Göttingen University, 1837, *de anno Hebræorum jubilæo*, by Kranald and Wolde; comp. Ewald's notice of the latter in the *Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenl.* i. p. 410 sq.

(2) In opposition to the usual explanation, Hupfeld (*id.* p. 10) thinks that the suffix in תִּשְׁמְטֶנָּה וְנָטַשְׁתָּה refers not to אַרְצָךְ but to תְּבוּאָתָהּ, and understands ver. 11 as inculcating not an omission of cultivation, but only a setting free of the produce. But even granting this certainly admissible construction, it is by no means justifiable to understand ver. 11 as though it said: In the seventh year thou shalt *indeed also sow* thy land, but leave its produce free. *Ἄτοπον γὰρ ἦν, ἑτέρους μὲν πονεῖν, ἑτέρους δὲ καρποῦσθαι*, as Philo (*de carit.* ii. p. 391) rightly remarks. On the contrary, ver. 11, according to its evident meaning, forms a contrast to the whole preceding verse.

(3) Compare Ranke, *Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch*, ii. p. 53.

(4) The meaning of this appointment is assuredly not, as Hupfeld, *id.* p. 13, understands it, that the produce of the sabbath year is to serve for the nourishment of the family to the *exclusion* of the poor; for hired servants and strangers did not (as is evident from Ex. xii. 45) belong to the family, and both classes having no possessions of land in the country, are

Digitized by Google

just those who must, on the contrary, be reckoned among the poor of the land (comp. Deut. xxiv. 14).

(5) See the information given on this point in Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xvi. pp. 283, 482, 693.

(6) Still the meaning of the law is not that this wild growth would suffice for the nourishment of the year; Lev. xxv. 20–22, on the contrary, assuming that the stores of former years were available.

(7) Or, if with Hupfeld, *id.* p. 21, we read מַשֵּׁה in ver. 2, and make יָדוֹ dependent on שֶׁמוֹט: every creditor shall let his hand rest with respect to that which he hath lent to his neighbour.

(8) A view which is probably to be regarded as already that of the LXX., who translate *ἀφήσεις πᾶν χρέος . . . καὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν σου οὐκ ἀπαιτήσεις*, which is then found in Philo, who, *de septen.* ed. M. ii. p. 277, designates the matter by *τὰ δάνεια χαρίζεσθαι*, and, p. 284, by *χρεωκοπία*, and is finally expressed in *Mishna Shebiith*, x. 1.

(9) According to the Mishna, *id.* § 8, the law was complied with if the creditor merely *promised* to remit the debt, and then, if the debtor insisted on making payment, received it as a gift,—a gift, that is, which the Gemara defines as one to which the debtor was previously pledged. For other expedients provided in the Mishna for lightening the burden entailed by this command, especially the so-called *Prosbul*, see the article quoted, p. 206. See also on this subject Geiger's *Lesestücke aus der Mischna*, pp. 4, 77 sq., and Saalschütz's *mos. Recht*, p. 164, note 208.

(10) We cannot see that this is opposed, as has been asserted, by ver. 9, for the consideration that money lent could not be called in during the sabbath year might well give rise to the refusal of loans during the period immediately preceding it. The command to respite debts has been frequently so combined with the law for letting the land lie fallow, as to represent the former as arising from a regard to the incapacity incurred by the debtor through his loss of the regular harvest. This combination cannot be entirely rejected, though the special motive for the law is a deeper one, as will be further shown in the subsequent discussion of the idea of the sabbatic year. It is generally acknowledged that the law for the emancipation of Hebrew bond-men and bond-maidens in the seventh year of

Digitized by Google

their bondage, which immediately follows the law for respiting debts, Deut. xv. 12–18, has no reference to the sabbatic year. This is evident even from ver. 14, which enjoins that the freed bond-man shall be furnished out of the floor and out of the wine-press,—an injunction presupposing a regular harvest.

(11) According to the view of most Rabbinists, even of Maimonides (*de juribus anni septimi et jubilæi*, vi. 6), both the sabbatic year and the year of jubilee began on the first of Tisri. The time, however, at which the Jewish year subsequently commenced, certainly gave rise to this view. There is no reason whatever for altering, with Hupfeld, בָּעָשׂוֹר of Lev. xxv. 9 into בָּאָחֹר. Gusset, *comment. ling. hebr. s.v.* שָׁמַם, defends the view which makes the sabbath year begin with the 1st Nisan. A comparison of the different views on this point is given by Majus, *dissert. de jure anni septimi*, p. 19.

(12) מִקֵּץ שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים, in Deut. xxxi. 10, does not mean "at the end of the seventh year," or even "after its expiration," *i.e.* at the beginning of the eighth, as *M. Sota*, vii. 8, understands the passage, but, like xv. 1, "at the end of a seven-years period," *i.e.* in the seventh year, generally speaking; comp. xxv. 18 with xxvi. 12.

(13) Philo, who frequently mentions the year of jubilee, always calls it the fiftieth; and Josephus expressly says, *Ant.* iii. 12. 3, that the lawgiver commanded to do the same as is done in the sabbath year, *μεθ' ἑβδόμην ἑτῶν ἑβδομάδα. Ταῦτα πεντήκοντα μέν ἐστιν ἔτη τὰ πάντα, καλεῖται δὲ ὑπὸ Ἑβραίων ὁ πεντηκοστὸς ἐνιαυτός Ἰώβηλος.*

(14) So Gatterer, Frank, and other older chronologists (comp. Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, i. p. 504; also Gusset, *id.*); and among moderns, especially Ewald, *Alterth. des Volkes Isr.* ed. 1, p. 385, ed. 3, p. 496.

(15) Saalschütz (*Archäologie der Hebräer*, ii. p. 229) tries another expedient: he supposes that the year of jubilee began with Nisan, and was composed of the second or summer half of the seventh sabbatic year and the first or winter half of the first year of a new sabbatic period. But though much may be said in favour of this acutely argued hypothesis of Saalschütz, still Lev. xxv. 9, taken in connection with ver. 10, does not give the impression that a consecration not taking place till the middle of the year of jubilee is here spoken of, nor is it natural

Digitized by Google

that the prohibition of sowing in ver. 11 should relate only to the first half of the year of jubilee.

(16) So already the LXX.: ἐνιαυτὸς ἀφέσεως; Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 12. 3: ἐλευθερίαν σημαίνει τὸ ὄνομα. On other explanations of the expression, see Majus on Maimonides, *de juribus, etc.*, p. 120 sq.; Carpzov, *App. ant.* p. 447 sq.

(17) Lev. xxv. 11: "Ye shall not sow, neither reap its (the land's) self-growth, nor gather its unpruned vine: for it is the jubilee; it shall be holy unto you: ye shall eat its increase out of the field." Even Isa. xxxvii. 30, in which a prospect of nourishment from what grew of itself, even in the second year, is held out to the people, because agriculture could not be pursued, is sufficient to remove any doubt as to whether the soil would yield crops worth speaking of in a second fallow year. The fertility of Palestine was certainly not less than that of Albania, where, according to Strabo, xi. 4. 3, one sowing yielded from two to three crops.

(18) This was opposed to the Lord's exclusive proprietorship of His redeemed people. Lev. xxv. 42: "For they are my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen.

(19) For further particulars, see the section on the condition of the servile class, § 110.

(20) Compare the laws of families, § 107. The law enacted nothing concerning an estate which had been *given away;* according to Maimonides, *id.* xi. 10, it was to be treated exactly as one that had been sold, and this is certainly consistent with the intention of the law (comp. Ezek. xliv. 17). On the other hand, the law of the year of jubilee did not extend to estates which had *devolved* on other families, namely, by the marriage of an Israelite with an heiress (see Num. xxxvi. 4), a passage whose meaning may be thus expressed, as by Hupfeld, *id.* p. 17: *though* the year of jubilee, which is to bring general restitution, be come, it shall not profit us: on the contrary, because the inheritance was not redeemed, according to the analogy of the law, Lev. xxvii. 21, it was now permanently alienated from the family. For this reason Moses commanded, Num. xxxvi. 8 sq., that for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of at least the inheritances of the tribes, an heiress could only marry within her own tribe.

Digitized by Google

(21) The houses of Levites in the cities appointed them, which as a possession belonging to the Levites in virtue of a Divine appointment were to be dealt with exactly as the inheritances of the other tribes (see Lev. xxv. 32–34), formed, however, an exception. In ver. 33 we should probably with the Vulgate read לֹא יִגְאַל; and hence the sense would be, "if one of the Levites does not redeem, the house that was sold shall go free in the year of jubilee." Keil, *bibl. Archäologie*, i. p. 376, on the other hand, gives, after the precedent of Hiskuni, the meaning of "sell" to גאל,—if one of the Levites sells,—which peculiar use of גאל he explains by the circumstance that all the possessions of the Levites were properly *ex Israelitarum hæreditate*. The above law was modified with respect to *hereditary fields devoted* to God, concerning which it was, in perfect harmony with the theocratic principle, enacted, Lev. xxvii. 16–21, that if any one had devoted a portion of his hereditary estate to Jehovah, the field was to remain in his possession, and he had to give only its crops to the sanctuary, or, more strictly speaking, to pay an equivalent in money, which was to be estimated according to the quantity of corn required for sowing it. The dedication extending only to the year of jubilee, the amount of money was regulated by the number of years yet to elapse. If, however, he should sell the field to another (not necessarily one belonging to another family) during the interval that it belonged to the sanctuary, and without having redeemed it according to the precept in ver. 19, he forfeited, by this arbitrary disposal of a property which he had renounced for the honour of God, his rights of possession and redemption. The estate henceforth fell to the priests as a thing devoted to the Lord, and was transferred to their possession. There is no foundation in the law for saying, with Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 12. 3, that debts also were remitted in the year of jubilee; the Rabbinists, too, testify to the contrary, —Maimonides *e.g.* remarking, *id.* x. 12, that in the remission of debts, the seventh year had an advantage over the year of jubilee.

Digitized by Google

§ 152.

Import and Practicability of the Institutions of the Sabbatic Year and the Year of Jubilee.

The *import* of these two institutions has been chiefly deduced from their value in a merely political and agricultural point of view (1). Thus J. D. Michaelis (*mos. Recht*, ii. § 74) seeks, with his accustomed eloquence, to show that the sabbatic year was intended to oblige the people to lay by during productive years, as the best means of preventing dearth. Others have regarded the manuring of the fields by the cattle, who were allowed to be turned loose in them, and very many the enhancement of the fertility of the soil by leaving it fallow, with the consequent promotion of the chase, as their main design, —a consideration which again occasions others to regard the acceptance of two successive fallow years as unreasonable. But of all this the law says not a word: it simply refers (Lev. xxv. 21 sq.) to the Divine blessing with which obedience was to be rewarded (2). With far greater discrimination than is manifested in the detection of such utilitarian considerations, does Ewald recur to that feeling for nature prevailing among the ancients, which assigned to the soil a Divine right to rest and forbearance (3). But this, too, fails to attain the true point of view clearly expressed, Lev. xxv. 2, in the words, "The land shall keep a sabbath to the Lord." It is upon the thought that man, acknowledging in act God's higher right of property ("the land is mine," ver. 23), should withhold his hand from cultivating the land, and place it wholly at the Lord's disposal for His blessing, that the whole ordinance is founded (4). It is at the same time the payment of a debt on the part of the land to Jehovah (comp. Lev. xxvi. 34; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21). Israel was thus taught, as Keil (*Archäologie*, i. p. 373) aptly remarks, that "the earth, though made for man, was yet not made merely that he might possess himself of its increase, but

Digitized by Google

that it might be holy to the Lord, and also partake of His blessed rest." Thus the *sabbath year* is in a certain sense a return to the condition existing before the words (Gen. iii. 17), "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life," were uttered (5). Equally, too, does the sabbath year typically point to the time when creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption (Rom. viii. 21). Besides, the increase wherewith God blessed the earth in the sabbath year being common to all, whether man or beast, and especially designed for the benefit of the poor, a check was thus put upon a selfish estimation of the rights of property, and the remembrance fostered that the Lord, upon whom the eyes of all wait that He may give them their meat in due season (Ps. civ. 27), would have every living thing satisfied with His gifts (Ps. cxlv. 16) (6). Finally, that the poor might really enjoy life, they were also to be released from exaction on the part of their creditors (7).

The year of jubilee, by which the sabbatic cycle was completed, while involving the idea of the sabbath year, has, moreover, its own specific import in the idea of *release*, and of the reinstatement of the theocracy in its original and divinely appointed order, in which all were, as the servants of God, to be free, and each was to be assured of his earthly maintenance, by being restored to the enjoyment of the inheritance allotted to his family for this purpose. The God who once redeemed His people from Egypt, and acquired them as His possession, here appears again as a redeemer (גֹּאֵל), to restore to the bondman his personal freedom, and to re-endow the poor with the share allotted him in the inheritance of his people. For among the covenant people no poor should properly have been found (Deut. xv. 4); and the fruit of a consistent carrying out of the law of the year of jubilee would at least have been that a proletariat could not have been found in Israel. Before such a year of grace, however, could appear, transgressions must have been pardoned; hence the year of jubilee was to be proclaimed

Digitized by Google

on the Day of Atonement (see Keil, *id.* p. 379). The sound of the trumpet, as it once proclaimed on Sinai the descent of the Lord for the promulgation of the law, was now to announce His gracious presence, and at the same time to serve as a summons to the congregation. In the prophecy, Isa. lxi. 1–3, the year of jubilee is as the year of ἀποκατάστασις regarded as typical of the times of Messiah, in which the discords of the world's history are to be resolved into the harmony of the Divine life. And hence Christ designates Himself as the fulfiller of this prophecy (Luke iv. 21); while Heb. iv. 9, by calling the perfected kingdom of God the σαββατισμός of the people of God, also refers to the type of the year of jubilee.

We proceed to inquire into the *practicability of the institutions of the jubilee and sabbatic year.* The difficulties are so evident, that it is impossible on this very account to explain the whole system as an extract from subsequent circumstances, and not as purely a result of the theocratic principle. Still the system was by no means absolutely impracticable, if the people were willing to sacrifice all selfish considerations to the Divine will. The omission of these ordinances was, however, already contemplated in Lev. xxvi. 35, while how far they were really carried into practice in post-Mosaic times does not appear. It is evident from 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, where it is said that the land lay desolate during the captivity seventy years, to make up for its sabbath years, that the celebration of the sabbatic year had been omitted during the last centuries before the captivity. If the number is taken exactly, the passage points to an omission of the sabbath year reaching back about 500 years, *i.e.* to the days of Solomon (8). Scarcely any traces of the year of jubilee, during the time preceding the captivity, are found in the Old Testament, and these in passages of doubtful interpretation; the most probable is in Isa. xxxvii. 30. Whether the chronological statement in Ezek. i. 1 ("in the thirtieth year") means the thirtieth year of a jubilee period (see Hitzig *in loc.* and on xl. 1) is very uncertain; while in

Digitized by Google

Ezek. vii. 12, on the contrary, we at all events meet with a reference to the ordinance of the jubilee, and in the prophetic legislation in Ezekiel the institution is certainly presupposed. The year of liberty mentioned Jer. xxxiv. 8–10, is not a year of jubilee. The release of the servants was appointed merely with reference to Ex. xxi. 2, Deut. xv. 12 sqq., the occasion perhaps being (see Hitzig *in loc.*) the occurrence of a sabbath year. The legal principle, on the contrary, for the preservation of which the year of jubilee was appointed, viz. that every family should retain its inheritance, had struck deep root in the nation. Comp. the narrative (1 Kings xxi. 3 sq.) of Naboth. Prophetic rebukes, too, like Jer. v. 8 sq. and Mic. ii. 2, etc., can only be fully understood from this point of view; while these very passages lead to the conclusion that a carrying out of the law of the jubilee was out of the question. After the captivity, the people, at the instigation of Nehemiah, bound themselves to the observance of the sabbatic years (Neh. x. 32), which, being frequently mentioned by Josephus (9), must have been henceforth the general practice. The laws specially relating to the year of jubilee were, on the contrary, never revived, though they may have exercised an influence on particular civil enactments (10). The ordinance of the sabbath year, later enactments concerning which are collected in *Mishna Shebiith*, was regarded as confined to the Holy Land, because it is said, Lev. xxv. 2, "When ye be come into the land," etc. (11). There was no sabbath year for any country beyond Palestine, though certain restrictions prevailed with respect to Syria, on account of its near relation to Palestine (12).

(1) What has already been said in our discussion of the Sabbath (§ 148, note 8) concerning such explanations, is generally applicable to these views. On the far-fetched hypothesis of Hug, *id.* p. 10 sqq., see the article quoted, p. 210.

(2) Speaking on this point, Schnell (*Das israel. Recht*, p. 28) very justly remarks: "Much has been at different times said of the agricultural and political advantages of this institution.

Digitized by Google

Moses, however, does not seem to have expected much from the prospect of such advantages, but rather to have anticipated the opposition of that common sense which was as active in his days as in ours, for here again he simply refers the people to the old fundamental thought of the whole sabbatic system, viz. the *Divine blessing*."

(3) See Ewald, *Alterthümer*, ed. 1, p. 378, ed. 2, p. 489: "The soil, too, has its Divine right to a necessary and therefore a Divine measure of rest and forbearance; nor must man be always exercising upon it his desire to labour and acquire. The soil yields its produce yearly, like a debt which it discharges to man, and upon which he may calculate as the reward of the labour he has bestowed upon it; but just as we cannot be at all times demanding payment from a human creditor, so must the land be left free at the proper season, without its debt being exacted from it." There is assuredly a certain ethical relation between an estate and its owner; hence the poet, Job xxxi. 38 sq., makes the land which had been torn from its lord cry out, and its furrows weep, because they do not bring forth for their lawful owner. How, then, should not the owner, on the other hand, have compassion on his land!

(4) The notion that an estate dedicated to the Deity was to remain unused, was one not unknown to other religions also; on the *ἀνείμενα* or *ἄνετα* among the Greeks, see Hermann, *gottesdienstl. Alterthümer der Griechen*, § 20, note 10.

(5) Therewith is connected the thought, again to use Keil's words, *id.*, "that the end of life for the Lord's flock does not consist in an incessant cultivation of the earth, combined with anxious labour in the sweat of their brow, but in the happy enjoyment of its fruits, which the Lord their God gives them without the work of their hands."

(6) Those appointments, Deut. xxiii. 25 sq., to our notions so impolitic, concerning the eating of grapes and the plucking of ears of corn, arose from the same consideration.

(7) Thus this rest which God would every seventh year bestow upon His people, is, according to the intention of the commandment, no more a rest of idle inaction than is that of the Sabbath-day. For, we ask, is the life of the patriarchs, in which agriculture was only an incidental occupation (Gen. xxvi. 12), to be regarded as a life of idleness? That public

Digitized by Google

reading of the law which took place at the beginning of the year involved, as has been already mentioned, a significant exhortation to a spiritual employment of this season. Ewald (*id.* ed. 1, p. 381, ed. 3, p. 491 sq.) thinks that this year may also have afforded opportunity for the more connected and continuous school instruction of both the young and adults.

(8) See Bertheau *in loc.*, and the rabbinist passages in Majus, *id.* p. 122 sq.

(9) Sabbatic years are mentioned, 1 Macc. vi. 49, 53; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 8. 1, xiv. 10. 6, xv. 1. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 2. 4; and among the Samaritans in the days of Alexander the Great, *Ant.* xi. 8. 6.

(10) Comp. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. p. 464.

(11) See Maimonides, *id.* iv. 22. For the distinction made with respect to Palestine itself, between the region taken possession of by the children of Israel at their return from Babylon, and that conquered after the departure from Egypt, see p. 212 of the article quoted.

(12) *Shebiith*, vi. 2, 5, 6; Maimonides, *id.* iv. 23. On this subject comp. Geiger, *Lesestücke aus der Mischna*, pp. 75 sq. and 79.

III. THE THREE PILGRIMAGE FEASTS.

(*a*) THE PASSOVER (1)

§ 153.

Enactments concerning the Solemnity.

The enactments relating to the Passover are found in Ex. xii. 1–28, 43–49, xiii. 3–9, xxiii. 15; Lev. xxiii. 5 sq.; Num. xxviii. 16–25; Deut. xvi. 1 sq. Ex. xii. 1–20 contains the entire law of the Passover, as delivered to Moses and Aaron before the fact with which this feast was to be connected had taken place,—a circumstance whose consideration will obviate many apparent difficulties. Next follows ver. 21 sqq., the promulgation of the

Digitized by Google

law by Moses to the people; this as well as its fulfilment is, in accordance with the circumstances of those times, given in a fragmentary manner. The proceedings at the celebration of the Passover were as follow: Four days previously (xii. 3), the paschal lamb, a male of a year old, for which a kid might be substituted, xii. 5, was to be set apart, one lamb for each family if sufficiently numerous to consume it, or if not, one for two families (2). This setting apart was performed, as tradition asserts, in a solemn manner, the lamb being formally consecrated, and every member of the household commanded to esteem it holy. During the whole of the festival nothing leavened might be eaten (comp. Deut. xvi. 3); hence on the 14th Abib or Nisan (the spring month) all leaven and leavened bread were cleared out of the house. The feast itself was to commence on the 14th Abib by the slaughter of the paschal lamb (בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם); on the different meanings of this expression, see the remarks on the daily burnt-offering (§ 131). We must assume (with Hengstenberg) that in general the preparations for the repast took place on the 14th, and the repast itself, which formed the commencement of the feast of unleavened bread, on the 15th. At the first celebration in Egypt, the lamb was undoubtedly slain by the head of the family, who seems on this occasion to have generally undertaken the functions of the priest. The two side-posts and lintel of the door were to be sprinkled with the blood of the animal. This was subsequently omitted, when the Passover was, according to Deut. xvi. 5–7, solemnized in the sanctuary, and the slaughter of the lamb took place in its court,—a fact already alluded to in Ex. xxiii. 17. In the great Passover of Hezekiah, 2 Chron. xxx. 16 sq., the Levites had the charge of killing the Passover chiefly for those who were not clean; in that of Josiah, on the contrary, xxxv. 11, and also in that mentioned Ezra vi. 20, the Levites were exclusively entrusted with this office. The slaying was subsequently performed by the laity also (3). The blood of the lambs was caught by the priests, and poured out or sprinkled upon the

Digitized by Google

altar, and the fat was burned upon it (4). The portions to be cast into the fire are called עֹלָה (burnt-offerings), 2 Chron. xxxv. 12. The whole animal was then eaten that same night, without a bone of it being broken, with unleavened loaves (מַצּוֹת) and bitter herbs (מְרֹרִים, wild lettuce, wild endive, etc.). None of it might be taken out of the house, nor was any of it to be left; or in case any portion remained, it was to be burned next morning. At the first Passover, they who ate it were to be *ready for a journey* (their staff in their hands, their shoes on their feet, and their loins girded); hence they were to eat standing, a particular subsequently omitted. It seems self-evident that *women* shared in the repast (5). *Strangers*, on the contrary, might not participate in it, until incorporated by circumcision among the covenant people, Ex. xii. 44, 48. It was this solemnity which was properly called פֶּסַח (6). According to xii. 13, it bore this name in remembrance of the fact that, in the night when the Lord slew the first-born of Egypt, He passed over and spared (פָּסַח)—strictly speaking (for this is the radical meaning of the word), leaped over—the Israelites (7). On this meaning see especially Isa. xxxi. 5, where the context shows (compare xxx. 29) that it is the Passover that is alluded to (8). In remembrance of what occurred at the institution of the Passover, the head of the household was, according to the subsequent ritual, with which we are not immediately concerned, to relate, in conformity with Ex. xii. 26 sq., the history of the deliverance of Israel during that night. The Hallel was then chanted by the assembled family, viz. Ps. cxiii. and cxiv., after the second cup and before eating the lamb, and Ps. cxv.–cxviii. before the fourth cup (9). *The seven days following the Feast of the Passover* are called in the Pentateuch חַג הַמַּצּוֹת, the feast of unleavened bread, because on them such bread alone might be eaten; see especially Lev. xxiii. 6–8. In Deut. xvi. 2, the שְׁלָמִים offered during this festal season are also comprised under the term פֶּסַח,—the oxen mentioned 2 Chron. xxxv. 7–9 being applied to such peace-offerings. Hence

Digitized by Google

the expression paschal food may also be used of the sacrificial repasts which occurred during the week (10). It seems also probable that the repasts of firstlings spoken of Deut. xv. 19 sq. were held during the paschal week (comp. § 136. 1) (11). The burnt-offerings and sin-offerings prescribed for the festal season are found, Num. xxviii. 19–24. The first and seventh days of the feast week were *days of rest;* for though in Deut. xvi. 8 (comp. Ex. xiii. 6) the sabbatic character of the seventh day only is asserted, this is explained by the consideration that it would have seemed superfluous expressly to ascribe this character to the first and chief day of the feast; and hence we find that the Deuteronomian law treats this point in the same manner in the cases also of Pentecost and the Feast of Tabernacles. According to the law, Lev. xxiii. 11, 15, the sheaf of first-fruits of barley was to be offered, *i.e.* waved before the Lord, מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת, on the day after the Sabbath, as a consecration of the harvest which was now commencing. There was, however, even among the ancient Jews, a dispute concerning the meaning of מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת. The Pharisees understood it of the day after the first day of the feast, thus making the waving of the sheaf take place on the 16th Nisan; the Baithosaites, of the day after the weekly Sabbath occurring in the time of the feast (12). Josh. v. 11, according to which the people ate, on the day after the Passover, parched corn of the produce of the land,—a fact which presupposes the offering of the sheaf of first-fruits,—decidedly favours the former view (13).

(1) The literature of the pilgrimage feasts is chiefly as follows: Hupfeld, *de primitiva*, etc.; the two programmes of the University of Halle for 1851 and 1852; Bachmann's *Die Festgesetze des Pentateuch*, 1858, chiefly directed against Hupfeld. Comp. also W. Schultz, *die innere Bedeutung der alttest. Feste, Deutsche Zeitschr.* 1857. Of the Passover: Baur, *über die ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Passahfestes und des Beschneidungsritus, Tubinger Zeitschr.* 1832, No. 1, p. 40 sqq.; and in opposition to Baur, Scholl, in Klaiber's *Studien der evang. Geistlichkeit Württembergs*, vol. ii., and Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. p.

Digitized by Google

640 sq.; Hengstenberg, *das Passah*, *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1852, No. 16.

(2) According to Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 9. 3, not less than from ten to twenty eaters were to be reckoned to one lamb.

(3) The number of Levites would, however, have scarcely sufficed for the enormous quantity of paschal lambs. At Josiah's Passover, the king alone, according to 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, distributed thirty thousand lambs to the people; while at the last Passover held at Jerusalem, the paschal offerings amounted, Josephus tells us, to 256,500.

(4) According to the undoubtedly correct statement of *Mishna Pesach*, v. 6, 10. The law enacted nothing in this respect.

(5) The Mishna also adopts this view. According to the Gemara, however, they were not obliged to be present as the males were.

(6) *πάσχα* in the LXX., after the Aramaic form in the *Status emphat.*

(7) Hence the word may also mean "to limp." On the other hand, it cannot, as Hengstenberg supposes, mean "to save, to deliver;" nor can it, as some of the Fathers think, and as Hengstenberg supposes possible, be connected with *πάσχω*. Josephus, *Ant.* ii. 14. 6, explains the word by *ὑπερβασία*.

(8) The hypothesis of Baur, *id.*, that פֶּסַח originally signified the passing of the sun into the sign of the ram, is entirely opposed to the common use of פֶּסַח. And even this consideration suffices to overthrow the whole hypothesis which connects the Passover with the Theban spring festival, at which sacrifices were offered to Amun, the ram-god, *i.e.* to the sun entering the sign of the ram. Scholl and Bähr, *id.*, have already shown how groundless this hypothesis is.

(9) Ps. cxiii.–cxviii. are generally called the great Hallel, though, strictly speaking, Ps. cxxxvi. might rather receive this appellation: "O give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good; and His mercy endureth for ever," etc. This Psalm was said at the close of the repast, after the Haggada-shel-pesach, the assembled guests responding in the twenty-six times repeated כִּי לְעוֹלָם חַסְדּוֹ.

(10) This has been applied, as is well known, to the question

Digitized by Google

raised by St. John's Gospel with respect to Christ's celebration of the Passover.

(11) See Riehm, *Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, p. 52.

(12) Hence the varying computations as to the time of this festival.

(13) The theory started by Hitzig, revived by Hupfeld, and refuted by Bähr, that the Passover always began on a Sunday and terminated on the 21st Nisan on a Saturday, and that this Sabbath is meant by מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת, presupposes an arrangement of the year making it always begin on a Sunday, of which there is no kind of proof. The after Passover, Num. iv. 11, which was to be kept by such Israelites as had been prevented by ceremonial uncleanness from celebrating the Passover, and subsequently by those also who could not reach the sanctuary in time, has been already mentioned, § 145.

§ 154.

Significance of the Feast of the Passover, and Questions connected with it.

According to what has been stated, the *significance of the Feast of the Passover* was, *generally speaking*, an *historical* one; it was, that is to say, *celebrated in remembrance of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt.* By keeping this festival, the Israelite testified that he belonged to that people whom the Lord had, by this act of deliverance, made His own possession (1). In an *agrarian* point of view, this feast was also the consecration of the *beginning of harvest.* Its *special import* is more difficult to define. First, it may be asked whether the *Passover transaction proper is to be regarded in the light of a sacrifice.* This question was an apple of discord among Romish and Protestant theologians. The former, in the interest of their dogma of sacrifice, affirmed that it was; the latter, for the same reason, felt bound to deny it, lest some dog-

Digitized by Google

matic support should thus be furnished to the Romish mass. Certain Reformed theologians, however, *e.g.* Vitringa, entertained less prejudiced views. Among moderns, Hofmann has (in his *Schriftbeweis*) disputed the sacrificial character of the Passover; and his view has been refuted upon cogent grounds by Kurtz (2). That no complete act of sacrifice should take place at the first Passover is but natural, the whole system of sacrifice being of later enactment; still the manipulation of the blood, by which the repast was preceded, had a thoroughly sacrificial import. The Passover is, moreover, exhibited in an expressly sacrificial point of view when it is said of it, Ex. xii. 27, וְזָבַחְתֶּם פֶּסַח הוּא לַיהוָה, comp. xxxiv. 25; and when Num. ix. 7, 13 designates its celebration as הַקְרִיב אֶת־קָרְבַּן יְהוָה. So too it is said, 1 Cor. v. 7: *τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη*; and Philo and Josephus both call it a sacrifice. The next question is, Under *what class of sacrifices is the Passover to be comprised?* Does it belong to the *sin-offerings*, or is it more akin to the *peace-offerings?* The former is maintained by Hengstenberg. "The Passover," he says, "is a sin-offering in the fullest and most special sense." But this view is absolutely irreconcilable with the most important feature of the Passover, viz. the consumption of the sacred animal by the family in whose name it was offered. It is beside the question to cite the eating of the flesh of the sin-offerings by the priests, for this was not done for the sake of their feeding on it (as has been shown, § 139); and the priest might not eat of the sin-offering offered for himself. The repast places the Passover in the ranks of the peace-offerings; and as there can be no peace-offering without an atonement, which is effected by the sprinkling of the blood, so too does the Passover presuppose an act of expiation effected by the application of the blood of the paschal lamb. But to say that the paschal lamb suffered death vicariously—that at the institution of the solemnity it died in the place of the first-born of Israel who had properly incurred death—is to assert that to which there is absolutely no allusion. The pure life of

Digitized by Google

the victim offered up in the blood served for a propitiation, and therefore for a purification for the family approaching the sacred meal. The application of the blood to the door-posts of the house, which formed the place of sacrifice at the first Passover, had the same significance as the atonement and purification of the sanctuary with the blood of the sacrifice on the Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 16. Covered and purified by this blood, the house was secured against the destroying angel, who went through the land of Egypt, which had incurred the Divine judgment. Thus the blood of atonement certainly is, as Hengstenberg expresses it, the wall of partition between the people of God and the world (3). The repast bore throughout the character of a feast. At the first Passover, the intention that the liberated people should commence their journey out of Egypt in the strength of this food, is included. Thus, too, did the Israelite receive at each Passover *new strength for the year just commenced.* An *individual* was not, however, to celebrate this feast, which was to be an *act of communion of the whole household.* Each family was at this repast to recognise that it was an integral element of the covenant people; and on the entire transaction was impressed the confession, "*As for me and my house*, we will serve the Lord" (Josh. xxiv. 15) (4). The prohibition to break a bone of the paschal lamb, certainly meant more than an injunction not to treat it like an ordinary slaughtered animal; it required (comp. the use of the expression, Ps. xxxiv. 21) the preservation of the lamb in its entirety, as a sign that those who were partakers of it were united in inseparable communion. Bähr rightly appeals in elucidation to the analogous passage, 1 Cor. x. 17 (5). The prohibition also *to carry any of it out of their houses* refers to that complete union of every family which the theocratic institutions enacted. *Unleavened bread* was, on account of its *purity*, to be eaten during the whole period of the feast; comp. above on leaven, § 124, and in elucidation, 1 Cor. v. 7 sq. As the newly consecrated priests were to eat unleavened bread seven days

Digitized by Google

(see Ex. xxix. 30 sqq. in connection with ver. 2), so also was Israel to do when thus celebrating their election to be the priestly nation. Ex. xiii. 8 and Deut. xvi. 3, which connect an *historical* reminiscence, viz. that of the haste of the departure from Egypt, with the use of unleavened bread, are not in opposition to this notion, Deuteronomy in particular being distinguished by its multiplication of motives. Whether this bread is called לֶחֶם עֹנִי in the passage in Deuteronomy because its insipidity recalled the fare of their Egyptian bondage, or merely because it was eaten at their deliverance from this affliction, must be left undecided. *The bitter herbs* were certainly a sign of the bitterness of Egyptian slavery, the fact of their imparting a flavour to the repast being no contradiction (6).

(1) Hupfeld, *id.*, denies, without any valid reason, the historical import of the Passover, and says that an historical occasion for its institution was a subsequent invention. This theory does not differ by a hair's breadth from that which refers the institution of the Lord's Supper to later invention.

(2) See Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, ii. ed. 1, p. 177 sqq., ed. 2, p. 270 sqq. Kurtz, *Geschichte des alten Bundes*, ii. p. 199 sqq.

(3) Hupfeld also aptly compares what was done at the consecration-offering of priestly investiture, Ex. xxix. 20, when the blood of the ram was applied for atonement and purification to the ear, hand, and foot of the priest (§ 95). Comp. also the purification of the leper.

(4) How domestic life was to be penetrated and illumined by the theocratic national principle, is best shown in the celebration of the Passover (article *Pädagogik des A. T.*).

(5) 1 Cor. x. 17: "For we, being many, are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread."

(6) The Passover, as a sacrifice, being connected with the sanctuary, the Israelites in exile celebrate it without the sacrificial lamb.

Digitized by Google

(*b*) THE FEAST OF WEEKS.

§ 155.

The *Feast of Weeks* (Pentecost), חַג הַשָּׁבֻעוֹת, owes its name to the fact that it was to be celebrated seven weeks after the Passover. The *more particular determination* of its time is, however, a subject of dispute, inasmuch as this depends on the already mentioned (§ 153) and variously understood passage, Lev. xxiii. 15 sq. It is there said: "Ye shall count unto you מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the wave sheaf," שֶׁבַע שַׁבָּתוֹת תְּמִימֹת תִּהְיֶינָה (seven full Sabbaths shall there be). If the Sabbath was, as we, § 153 (according to the usual interpretation), thought most probable, the first day of the paschal feast, שַׁבָּתוֹת here means *weeks*. The word has this meaning in Aramaic, and the predicate תְּמִימֹת favours it; the passage in Deuteronomy substitutes שִׁבְעָה שָׁבֻעוֹת. It would thus be translated: "seven whole weeks shall there be" (and ver. 16: "till the day following after the seventh week"). According to this computation, which thus makes the *terminus a quo*, the sheaf-day, to be the 16th Nisan, the Feast of Pentecost would always fall on the same day of the week as the 16th Nisan. And such is the modern Jewish custom (1). If the other explanation of מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת (ver. 15), which makes the expression שַׁבָּת mean the Sabbath proper (Saturday), be adopted, the Feast of Weeks would, on the contrary, have always been kept on a Sunday. The second name of this feast was חַג הַקָּצִיר (the feast of harvest), or חַג הַבִּכּוּרִים (the feast of first-fruits). Accordingly it has in the Pentateuch the significance of a *harvest thanksgiving;* and indeed of a feast of thanksgiving for the *completed* corn harvest,—the Feast of Weeks thus bearing the same relation to the wheat harvest as the Passover did to the barley harvest, which was the first crop reaped. *An historical meaning* was first given to this feast by *the later Jews*, who made it refer to the *giving of the law upon Mount*

Digitized by Google

Sinai, which is said by Jewish tradition to have taken place on the fiftieth day after the departure from Egypt, while Ex. xix. 1 states quite generally that it was in the third month. This reference, however, is not yet mentioned, even in Philo. The central point in the religious celebration of this festival of one day's duration (2), was *the offering of the two loaves of first-fruits* for the whole people, and not, as some have understood the law, for each house. As the wave sheaf at the Passover was a sign that the harvest had begun, so were these wave loaves, לֶחֶם הַתְּנוּפָה, a sign that the harvest was completed. Being prepared and leavened from the flour of the newly reaped wheat, Lev. xxiii. 17, the ordinary food of the people was hallowed in them. As leavened, they could not be burned upon the altar, but were to be consumed by the priests. With the offering of these loaves were combined large burnt, sin, and peace offerings, ver. 18. The directions in Num. xxviii. 27 sqq. differ somewhat from this law. If two kinds of offering are to be understood in the two passages, the general festival sacrifices are intended in Num. xxviii., and only the pentecostal offerings which accompanied the two loaves in Lev. xxiii. 18. The feast was enlivened by festal repasts, Deut. xvi. 11, which were furnished by the נְדָבוֹת, and served at the same time as benefactions; for Levites, strangers, widows, and orphans were to partake of them.

(1) *E.g.* in the year 1871 the 15th Nisan was a Thursday (April 6), the 16th or the homer day a Friday (April 7), and the Feast of Weeks on the 6th Sivan a Friday (May 26).

(2) By the Mosaic law, the feast was of but one day's duration. Among the later Jews, we always find two feast days for the sabbatic days of the Old Testament feasts, with the exception of the Day of Atonement. Hence not only is there a two days' celebration of the festivals of Pentecost and the new year, but the first and seventh days of the Passover are also doubled. So also does the Feast of Tabernacles begin with two holy days. The occasion of this twofold celebration of the feast days, which took place in the Jewish dispersion even

Digitized by Google

in the days of the second temple, was as follows. The time of the new moon was determined by the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. Now it was upon this that the whole system of festivals depended; hence those new moons, at least, which were of importance in determining the period of a festival, were signalled by the lighting of fires from the Mount of Olives to certain appointed stations. The Jews dwelling at a distance, in Egypt, Asia Minor, Greece, etc., whom the intelligence that the new moon had appeared could not reach in time, had consequently to celebrate the more important festivals twice, so that the feast might be kept at the same time everywhere on at least one of the days. Comp. Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronol.* i. p. 512 sqq.; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden vom Untergang des jüdischen Staats*, 1853, p. 82; and see further particulars in my article *Feste der späteren Juden*, in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* iv. p. 390 sq.

(*c*) THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

§ 156.

The *Feast of Tabernacles*, חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת, was kept in the seventh month, from the fifteenth day onwards. Its duration was strictly only seven days. To these were added an eighth, also of a sabbatic character, the so-called עֲצֶרֶת, Lev. xxiii. 36 (of which hereafter). The *historic import* of this feast was to remind the people, by a seven days' dwelling in booths made of boughs, of the wandering of their fathers in the wilderness, during which they had to dwell in booths, Lev. xxiii. 42 sq. The admission of this festival into Zechariah's prophecy of Messianic times, Zech. xiv. 18, is undoubtedly founded on the kindred thought, that the keeping of the Feast of Tabernacles is an expression on the part of the nations, of their thankfulness for the termination of their wanderings, by their reception into the peaceful kingdom of the Messiah. According to its *agrarian import*, this feast was חַג הָאָסִיף, Ex. xxiii. 16, the feast of ingathering, *i.e.* of fruit and wine, in which respect it terminated

Digitized by Google

the agricultural year. It was the greatest feast of rejoicing of the year, and provided with more numerous sacrifices than the others, Num. xxix. 12–34 (1). Very splendid ceremonies were subsequently added to it, especially the daily *libation of water*, probably with reference to Isa. xii. 3, and the *illumination* of the court on the first day of the feast,—customs to which perhaps the words of Christ, John vii. 37, viii. 12, may refer (2). The eighth day of the feast bore, as we have said, the name of עֲצֶרֶת, Lev. xxiii. 36, Num. xxix. 35, which is also applied, Deut. xvi. 8, to the closing day of the paschal week. The explanation of this word, *a cohibitione operis*, of the intermission of labour, is improbable, as not showing why the name applies to these two days only. The expression probably means *conclusion*, viz. of the feast-time; and it is thus understood by the LXX., who render it by ἐξόδιον in the passages cited (3). The Azereth of the Feast of Tabernacles, however, undoubtedly signified not merely the *clausula festi*, but also *the close of the whole annual cycle of feasts* (4). Hence the עֲצֶרֶת was rightly regarded by the Jews as a separate feast, to which a further festival was also subsequently added on the 23d Tisri, viz. the rejoicing of the law (שִׂמְחַת הַתּוֹרָה), to celebrate the termination of the annual reading of the law.

Thus the festal half of the Israelitish ecclesiastical year coincided with the season in which the annual blessings of nature were gathered; while during the wintry half of the year, on the contrary, the course of the Sabbaths and new moons were, according to the Mosaic ritual, uninterrupted by festivals (5).

(1) Josephus and Philo consider it in every respect the chief festival of the year.

(2) Isa. xii. 3: "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." Most probably John vii. 37, "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink," refers to the pouring out of water, of which it has been said that he

Digitized by Google

who has not seen the rejoicing at the drawing of water at the Feast of Tabernacles does not know what rejoicing is. Perhaps viii. 12, "I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life," may refer to the illumination. It is quite intelligible that the Greeks (see Plutarch, *Sympos.* iv. 6. 2) should regard the Feast of Tabernacles, on account of its connection with the vintage, as a feast of Bacchus; it is only unintelligible that many moderns should have laid any weight on such a circumstance.

(3) On the other hand, the expression subsequently acquired the further meaning of a solemn assembly, Joel i. 14. Compare the use of the word עֲצֶרֶת, 2 Kings x. 20.

(4) So Philo, *de septen.* § 24, ed. Mang. ii. p. 298, already understood the matter.

(5) It was not till afterwards that the Feast of the Dedication in the ninth, and the Feast of Purim in the twelfth month, with which we are not at present concerned, were inserted. See *Prophetism*, and the article cited, p. 388 sq.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PART II.—PROPHETISM.

FIRST SECTION.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEOCRACY, FROM THE DEATH OF JOSHUA TO THE CLOSE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT REVELATION.

FIRST DIVISION.

THE TIMES OF THE JUDGES.

1.—THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE THEOCRACY TILL THE TIMES OF SAMUEL.

§ 157.

Course of Events. Import of the Office of Judge.

THE history of the period of the judges, when viewed from the theocratic point of view in which it is contemplated in the Book of Judges, and especially in the second introduction to this book (ch. ii. 6–iii. 6) (1), presents a constant alternation between the apostasy of the people and their consequent chastisement by the Divine Power, on the one hand, and the return of the people to their God and the Divine deliverances therewith connected, on the other. The course of events during the three centuries preceding the time when Samuel filled the post of judge, may be generally described as follows: —After Joshua, who had no immediate successor, and the other elders, who "had known all the works of the Lord that He had done for Israel" (Josh. xxiv. 31), had passed from the

Digitized by Google

scene, the nation was left to itself, that its life might now be freely developed under theocratic institutions. So long as the remembrance of the Divine manifestations endured, the people remained faithful to these institutions. Even the internal war against the tribe of Benjamin, related in the sequel of the Book of Judges (ch. xix.–xxi.), which, occurring during the high-priesthood of Phinehas, must have been waged shortly after the death of Joshua, is an indication that the theocratic zeal of the nation had as yet suffered no diminution. This is, however, the last occasion for many years on which we meet with the united action of the whole people. For Joshua having committed the further execution of the work of conquest to the individual tribes, it ceased to be the common concern of the nation, and opportunity was thus given for the promotion of private interests. The several states were not always entirely successful in the petty warfare which they carried on; a portion of the still remaining Canaanites were not subdued, against others the sentence of extermination was not strictly carried out. Those who were rendered merely tributary, and suffered to dwell among the Israelites, not only seduced the people to the service of Canaanitish gods, but also regained the mastery in isolated parts of the land. Irruptions of numerous nomadic hordes of Midianites and Amalekites from the east ensued, while the nation was repeatedly exposed to danger from the hostile attacks of the neighbouring Moabites and Ammonites. In the west, the power of the Philistine Pentapolis, situate on the low-lying plains near the Mediterranean, became increasingly formidable during the middle period of the judges. The oppressions which the Israelites suffered at the hand of these different nations usually extended only to certain tribes; but this very circumstance was the reason that not even these afflictions were capable of drawing the tribes out of their isolation, and uniting them in a common enterprise. Such slothful selfishness on the part of individual tribes, in withdrawing from the national cause, is sharply reproved in the

Digitized by Google

Song of Deborah, Judg. v. 15–17 (2). In times of oppression like these (when the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, ch. iii. 9, 15, iv. 3, etc.), individuals called judges arose, who, aroused by the Spirit of Jehovah, turned back the heart of the people to their God, revived in them the remembrance of God's dealings with them in past times, and then broke the hostile yoke under which they were suffering. The whole intention of the narrative of this book is not, however, fulfilled in the glorification of these men as the heroes of the nation,—its purport being rather to show that the help afforded was the result of an outpouring of the Divine Spirit; and that God, in effecting the deliverance of His people, made choice of the lowly and despised as His instruments. Compare what is already said of Shamgar, iii. 31. Very instructive in this respect is the history of Gideon, the most prominent among the earlier judges; see such passages as vi. 15, vii. 2 (3). It was on this account that these ministers of the theocracy were called, not kings or rulers, but Shophetim (judges). This name must not, moreover, be specially restricted to the exercise of the judicial office, though its performance is asserted in the cases of Deborah (iv. 5), Eli, and Samuel (4), and must be assumed in that of others in so far as they remained for any length of time at the head either of the whole nation or of single tribes. It bears a more general signification, and represents these men as advocates of those Divine claims which it was their part to maintain and restore. The office of judge was neither permanent nor hereditary, but purely personal. Called to a prominent position by the necessities of the times, they interposed with energy in the affairs of the individual tribes at the head of which they were placed, but exercised no abiding influence upon the nation, which, on the contrary, relapsed into its former course, when its burdens were lightened or when the judge was dead; comp. especially the passage ii. 16–19 (5).

(1) There is, at the commencement of the Book of Judges, a double introduction, ch. i.–iii. 6, whose purpose is to serve as

Digitized by Google

a key to the course upon which the history of Israel now enters. Comp. Cassel, *das Buch der Richter, Einleitung*, p. viii.: "The first two chapters form a practical introduction to the history of the book in general. They explain the *possibility* of the ensuing events: the germs of the approaching contests could not have been deposited in the history of Joshua, who followed in the spirit of the law the footsteps of Moses. The soil for its reception was first offered by the proceedings of the tribes after his decease."

(2) In the Song of Deborah, Judg. v., after praising those tribes who had taken part with her in the conflict, she continues, 15–17: "At the brooks of Reuben there were great resolves of heart. Why didst thou remain among the sheepfolds? At the brooks of Reuben there were great resolves of heart. Gilead remained beyond Jordan; and why did Dan remain in ships? and why did Asher continue on the sea-shore, and remain in his bays?"

(3) When the Divine summons was addressed to him under the terebinth at Ophrah, Gideon acknowledged himself one of the least of his tribe, Judg. vi. 15 ("My family is poor in Manasseh, and I am the least in my father's house"); and it was on this account that the Lord had to overcome his natural timidity by miraculous testimonies of His presence. (With the sign, vi. 21, comp. Lev. ix. 24.) According to Judg. viii., the victory was not to be obtained by the considerable forces at Gideon's disposal, but by a small number filled with courageous confidence in God (ver. 2: "The people that are with thee are too many for me to give the Midianites into their hands, lest Israel vaunt themselves against me, saying, Mine own hand hath saved me"). Hence Gideon was directed to dismiss 22,000 who were fearful and afraid; comp. with viii. 3, Deut. xx. 8. Instead of the difficult "from Mount Gilead," we must read either "Gilboa," or, according to Ewald's ingenious explanation, *Geschichte Israels*, i. 1st div. p. 388, 3d div. p. 543, understand the expression proverbially. The remaining 10,000 were, however, still too many, and from them the Lord selected at the brook 300, who lifted the water to their mouths with their hands while standing. (These are contrasted with those who knelt down that they might drink in comfort and at leisure; not the cowardly, as Josephus already explains the passage, but those

Digitized by Google

filled with a zeal which would not brook delay.) The history of Gideon is given in greater detail than that of the other judges. He was the son of Joash, of Ophrah in the tribe of Manasseh, and undoubtedly in the portion west of Jordan, of the race of Abi-ezer (Judg. vi. 11, 24, comp. ver. 34). His appearance as judge was occasioned by the oppression of the Midianites, who for seven years had so grievously molested Israel, that the people were compelled to hide in caves and mountains to secure themselves from the incursions of these nomadic hosts. How deeply the deliverance wrought by Gideon was imprinted on the memory of the nation, is evident from Isa. ix. 3, x. 26, Ps. lxxxiii. 10, 12. For further particulars, see the article *Gideon* in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* v. p. 150 sq.

(4) Of Samuel it is stated, 1 Sam. vii. 15, that he administered justice in various cities of the land; and, viii. 2, that he made his sons judges in Beer-sheba (Art. *Gericht und Gerichtsverwaltung*).

(5) Most of the judges seem, after effecting the work of deliverance to which they were called, to have remained for the rest of their lives at the head of a portion of the nation (Art. *Volk Gottes*).

§ 158.

Religious Condition: Decline of the Theocratic Institutions.

The state of religion during the period of the judges, the decline of the theocratic institutions, and the intermingling of the worship of Jehovah with the Canaanitish deification of nature, are abundantly manifested by the description of the nation just given. But are we justified, it may be asked, in speaking of a decline of theocratic institutions, and does the Book of Judges really presuppose a legislation and a history such as the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua attest? (1). Does it not rather exhibit an embryonic and undeveloped condition in which those elements are still fermenting, from which

Digitized by Google

a system of theocratic institutions will subsequently be consolidated? (2). This latter view is opposed, generally speaking, not only by the already mentioned express declaration in ch. ii. (especially ver. 10 sq.), but also by the manner in which the present condition of the people is contrasted with their past glories (3) in the Song of Deborah (v. 4), the genuineness of which no one has as yet ventured to impugn. So far, however, as religious institutions in particular are concerned, it must be observed that it is alien to the entire purpose of the Book of Judges to enter into the subject, and consequently the inference that institutions not mentioned therein could not have existed, is utterly unjustified. This applies equally to the Book of Joshua, which more confessedly presupposes the Pentateuch. If, *e.g.*, it were to be inferred that, because an annual festival (whether that of Tabernacles or the Passover) at the national sanctuary is mentioned but once in the Book of Judges (ch. xxi. 19), no such cycle of festivals as is prescribed in the Pentateuch as yet existed, this would equally apply to the Book of Joshua, which mentions a festival, viz. the Passover, only in a single passage (ch. v. 10), and also to the subsequent historical books, with the exception of Chronicles. There are, however, quite sufficient data in the Book of Judges to show that, although during this period and down to Samuel the injunctions or ordinances of the law were for the most part neglected, and in some particulars not yet introduced, the theocractic institutions, as they are said to have existed under Moses and Joshua, are nevertheless in all essential matters presupposed (4). The main question is: *Does the Book of Judges know of a central sanctuary as the alone authorized place of sacrifice?* or did several sanctuaries of Jehovah exist contemporaneously in the times of the Judges? at least, was such worship carried on at different holy places at the same time? (5). The actual state of affairs is as follows:—Even during their wanderings in the wilderness, and under the eye of the lawgiver, the people could not be prevailed upon, as is evident from Lev. xvii. 5,

Digitized by Google

Deut. xii. 8, to renounce the custom of sacrificing in any place they might choose. How much less, then, would this be accomplished at a time when there was no individual of pre-eminent influence to enforce the claims of the law; and when the people, dwelling among, and entering into religious intercourse with the Canaanites, mingled their heathen customs with the worship of Jehovah, nay, even addicted themselves chiefly to the adoration of the gods of the land! Were we hence to infer that the law concerning unity of worship was not then in existence, we should be equally obliged to affirm this of the whole period down to the captivity, since, notwithstanding the severe measures of several kings, the high places for worship could never be wholly abolished. The creation of the idolatrous sanctuary of Micah is explained, Judg. xvii. 6, by the fact that "every man did that which was right in his own eyes," while the condemnation of Gideon's schismatical worship (of which hereafter, § 159), viii. 27, can only be understood by assuming the exclusive legality of the one national sanctuary. With respect, however, to the sacrifices mentioned ch. vi. 18, xiii. 16, these were justified by the theophany which preceded them, and were in accordance with patriarchal usage (comp. § 114). In neither case is the institution of a permanent sacrificial service in question. This does not, however, apply to the time of Samuel, of which hereafter (§ 160). The national sanctuary, the tabernacle, was during the times of the judges permanently located at Shiloh, Josh. xviii. 1, xix. 51; Judg. xviii. 31; 1 Sam. i. sq.; comp. with Ps. lxxviii. 60; Jer. vii. 12. It was there that the annual festivals were solemnized, Judg. xxi. 19, 1 Sam. i. 3 sq.; and there that the regular sacrificial worship was offered, ii. 12 sq. A second legitimate tabernacle in some other locality is not once spoken of. The sanctuary under the oak at Shechem, mentioned Josh. xxiv. 26, probably refers to the altar built there by Abraham, Gen. xii. 6 sq. (6); a holy place there is also spoken of, Gen. xxxv. 4. Nothing is said, however, of sacrificial worship being there

Digitized by Google

offered. In military engagements, the ark of the covenant used (even down to the building of the temple, 2 Sam. xi. 11, comp. xv. 24) to be brought to the central point of the battle, and sacrifices were there offered before it. Thus, in the contest against Benjamin, when it is said that all the people flocked to Bethel, Judg. xx. 26, it is evident from ver. 27 that the ark was there; there was, however, no permanent sanctuary, an altar being, as is shown by xxi. 4, erected only for a temporary purpose (7). The whole narrative, 1 Sam. iv., according to which the carrying away of the ark was regarded as a terrible calamity, is deprived of all meaning unless the existence of but a single ark is assumed (8). The fact that the Books of Judges and Samuel take but little notice of the individual enactments concerning sacrifice in the Pentateuch, is easily accounted for by the nature of their contents. The only remarkable circumstance is, that though we frequently meet with the burnt-offering and the peace-offering, a sin-offering is never mentioned, not even in 2 Sam. xxiv. 25,—a phenomenon which indeed occurs also in the Book of Joshua. It seems that a special use of עֹלָה prevails here; and that this expression, as is evidently the case in Ezra viii. 35, comprises, in contradistinction to זֶבַח, the sin-offering also (see Hengstenberg, *Beiträge*, iii. p. 86 sq.). The peace-offering of the Pentateuch is presupposed 1 Sam. ii. 13–17 (9). It has also been remarked *that the Book of Judges knows not of the destination of the tribe of Levi, as appointed in the Pentateuch.* On the other hand, we regard it as a prominent and remarkable fact, that the Levites appear in the Book of Judges in exactly that position which Deuteronomy assumes, when it always classes them with the strangers on account of their poverty. The case seems to have been as follows. All the Canaanites not being driven out when the land was conquered, the cities destined to the Levites did not come into the undisturbed possession of the Israelites, *e.g.* Gezer, Josh. xxi. 21, comp. with xvi. 10; Ajalon, Josh. xxi. 24, comp. with Judg. i. 35. Hence it would be quite natural for

Digitized by Google

many of the Levites to seek an asylum in cities not included in the list of those allotted to them. Thus, in Judg. xvii. 7 sq., a Levite is spoken of as sojourning as a stranger (גָּר) in Bethlehem, and departing thence to Mount Ephraim; and in xix. 1, a Levite is also said to be dwelling as a stranger on the northern side of Mount Ephraim (10). It is not difficult to show why there were as yet no organized Levitical services, the services appointed to the Levites in the Pentateuch ceasing with the wanderings of the tabernacle, and nothing being enacted in the law with respect to their further employment; while the period of the disintegration of the theocracy was one utterly unadapted for the production of new ritual enactments. Still the expression used xix. 18 by the Levite, אֶת־בֵּית יְהוָה אֲנִי הֹלֵךְ, which is to be understood, "I walk in the house of the Lord," refers to a connection of this Levite with the sanctuary (11). The narrative ch. xvii. sq. also shows that the fact of this tribe being appointed to the service of the sanctuary was well known. According to xvii. 13, Micah congratulates himself on obtaining a Levite as priest to his image-worship. This priest, who was subsequently appointed to the sanctuary set up in Dan, was, according to xviii. 30, Jonathan, a descendant of Moses (12). The position occupied by the Levites after the times of David would be quite inexplicable, unless preceded by the separation which the law of this tribe to the service of the sanctuary appointed.

With respect to the history of the priesthood, there is in this case also a great gap in the historical books of the Old Testament. Aaron, whose choice is also mentioned 1 Sam. ii. 27 sq., was, after his death, succeeded by his two surviving sons Eleazar and Ithamar, the former filling the high-priestly office, Num. xx. 28, Deut. x. 6, Josh. xiv. 1, and being succeeded therein by his son Phinehas; comp. Judg. xx. 28. The history of the high-priesthood is not again taken up till Eli, 1 Sam. i. sq., who was, according to tradition (Josephus, *Antiq.* v. 11. 5), with which the further course of Old Testa-

Digitized by Google

ment history coincides, of the line of Ithamar. The reason for the transmission of the high-priestly dignity to this line is unknown. On the high priests between Ithamar and Eli, see Josephus; and on the genealogy of Eleazar, 1 Chron. v. 29 sq., vi. 35 sq.; Ezra vii. 1 sq. (13).

(1) Great stress has always been laid upon this point by the opponents of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

(2) This has been especially pointed out by De Wette and Vatke. To draw such inferences from a book which, like that of Judges, includes a period of 300 years in twenty-one chapters, is *à priori* a very doubtful proceeding. In the Old Testament the points referring to Divine worship must chiefly be discussed.

(3) Judg. v. 4 sq.: "Lord, when Thou wentest out of Seir, when Thou marchedst out of the field of Edom, the earth trembled, and the heavens dropped, the clouds also dropped water. The mountains melted from before the Lord, that Sinai before the Lord God of Israel." Then follows a description of recent times: "In the days of Shamgar the son of Anath, in the days of Jael, the highways were unoccupied, and the walkers in paths walked through byways. There lacked leading in Israel, there lacked, till I Deborah arose, till I arose a mother in Israel. They chose new gods; then was war in the gates. Was there a shield or spear seen among forty thousand in Israel?"

(4) On what follows, comp. especially Hengstenberg, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das A. T.* iii. p. 1 sqq.

(5) Vatke, *Religion des A. T.* p. 264, brings forward seven such holy places.

(6) Unless, which would be the single exception, the tabernacle, which indeed was to continue a wandering sanctuary (comp. 2 Sam. vii. 6), were transported for a time from Shiloh to the neighbouring Shechem.

(7) That sacrifices should be offered wherever the ark was, is quite natural when its significance is considered. On similar grounds, the act of sacrifice related 1 Sam. vi. 15 is not surprising. When it is there said that "the men of Beth-shemesh brought burnt-offerings," the expression does not exclude the

Digitized by Google

co-operation of the priests. Beth-shemesh was, moreover, one of the cities of the priests.

(8) Those who, for the sake of the theory that there were several sanctuaries, embrace also the notion of several arks, have the usage of the language, which constantly speaks of *the* (definite) ark, against them.

(9) Of this there is no doubt. The fat is designated as the part belonging to Jehovah; and it is brought forward as the special transgressions of the sons of Eli, that they demanded their portion before the fat was burned to the Lord, etc. (see Hengstenberg's above-named work, p. 87 sqq.).

(10) Others, as is assumed Deut. xviii. 6–8, might, after selling their property, settle at the place of the sanctuary, and they were then entitled to like maintenance with the ministering Levites. How such maintenance was to be supplied, we are not told,—probably from the free-will offerings. (Article *Levi, Levites.*)

(11) Judg. xix. 18 cannot mean, "I am going *to* the house of the Lord," for אֵת never occurs with the accusative of direction.

(12) The reading מְנַשֶּׁה with *Nun suspensum* is confessedly a later alteration for מֹשֶׁה. In the case, too, of Samuel, his employment in the service of the sanctuary (1 Sam. ii. 18) coincides with his Levitical descent.

(13) In these genealogies it is not said which of the descendants of Eleazar therein enumerated filled the office of high priest, and which did not. It is not necessary on this occasion to give such particulars as are afforded by tradition. Compare my article *Hohepriester* in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* vi. p. 204.

§ 159.

Continuation: Religious Syncretism of the Period.

The *religious syncretism*, the foundations of which were (as before remarked, § 26) already laid during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, was manifested in *a twofold manner* during the age of the judges. *First*, by a blending of the worship of Jehovah with heathenism, on the part of those

Digitized by Google

Israelites who had fallen into Canaanitish idolatry. Thus in the worship of Baal or El-berith, to whom a temple was dedicated at Shechem, Judg. viii. 33, ix. 4, 46, the idea of the covenant God was transferred to Baal. *Secondly*, by the fact that, even among those who adhered to the worship of Jehovah, the religious consciousness was more or less obscured by heathen ideas. This was manifested chiefly in the image-worship of Micah and the Danites. To this would be added, according to a widely accepted theory, the conduct of Gideon, who, after having destroyed the worship of Baal at Ophrah, vi. 12 sq. (1), delivered Israel from the oppression of the Midianites, and refused in a truly theocratic spirit the hereditary sovereignty offered him (viii. 23), is said himself to have set up (viii. 24) an idolatrous image-worship. We must not, however, understand by the ephod which he caused to be made, an image of Jehovah, אֵפוֹד not being generally used in the sense of image. It is evident from xvii. 5, xviii. 14, 17, that the ephod is distinguished from תְּרָפִים, פֶּסֶל, and מַסֵּכָה, and merely signifies the garment of the high priest (2). It is true that the large quantity of gold collected by Gideon was not required for the garment with the breast-plate (comp. also Ex. xxviii. 6 sq., xxxix. 2 sq.), but neither are we told that it was all used (comp. the construction of עָשָׂה, Hos. ii. 10) (3). In fact, it is not said that Gideon set up an idol, but that, by renouncing the legally ordained priesthood, he instituted a schismatical worship. His preparation of an ephod was designed to furnish a means of interrogating the Divine will by Urim and Thummim; and his motive for separating from the legitimate sanctuary may certainly be found in the fact of its being situated in the midst of the tribe of Ephraim, which was hostile to him. The censure expressed by the narrator is shown to be fully justified by the results which ensued after Gideon's death, see viii. 33, when this schismatical worship facilitated the relapse of the people to the worship of Baal, who was syncretistically worshipped as Baal-berith (4). Finally, we

Digitized by Google

are told of the judge Jephthah, xi. 28–40, that when he went out against the Ammonites, he vowed, if he should return victorious, to offer as a burnt-offering to Jehovah whatever should come forth to meet him from the doors of his house, and that when this proved to be his own daughter, who was also his only child, he did not dare to break his vow, but accomplished it upon her. With respect to this matter, the view which prevailed in Jewish antiquity (see Josephus and the Targums) and among the Fathers of the Church, and which was also embraced by Luther, is that Jephthah really slew his daughter, and offered her as a burnt-offering upon the altar. The notion that Jephthah only consecrated his daughter to the service of the sanctuary in a state of life-long virginity, was first urged by certain mediæval Rabbinists, and has since been maintained, after the precedent of Hengstenberg (*Beiträge*, iii. p. 127 sq.), by many moderns (Cassel, Gerlach, Keil), who refer in confirmation to Ex. xxxviii. 8 and 1 Sam. ii. 22, where women are indeed mentioned as serving in the sanctuary, but whose obligation to celibacy cannot be proved. According to this view, the fulfilment of the vow would lie in the words, Judg. xi. 39, וְהִיא לֹא־יָדְעָה אִישׁ, which must not be taken as pluperfect ("and she had known no man"), but as an account of what now took place: "and she knew no man." It must be granted that there are features in the narrative which may be made to favour this view, and especially the consideration that, when Jephthah placed at God's disposal whatever should first come forth from his house to meet him, he must have contemplated the possibility of its being a human being, in which case it was impossible that he would have intended a human sacrifice; and the more so, since no such sacrifice is mentioned in the time of the Judges, even among those Israelites who apostatized to Canaanitish idolatry. It may be further conceded that the grief of the father is also accounted for by the view in question, all prospect of posterity being cut off by the devotion of this his only child to celibacy. Still this interpretation is at variance

Digitized by Google

with the plain meaning of the words, "he did unto her according to his oath," which in their reference to ver. 31 cannot relate to a merely spiritual sacrifice. It cannot, however, be inferred from the narrative that human sacrifices were at this time *legal* in the worship of Jehovah, the matter being evidently represented as a horrible exception. The history, indeed, shows that in those days, when the worship of Baal and Moloch was still contending for the mastery with that service of Jehovah, which was not as yet firmly established in the minds of men, the fear of the Holy One of Israel, the avenger of broken vows, might, even in the heart of a servant of the Lord, be perverted to the shedding of human blood for the sake of keeping a rashly uttered vow (5). The narrative of the Benjamite war and the slaughter of the inhabitants of Jabesh (xxi. 5–10) also show to what an extent theocratic zeal held the sanguinary fulfilment of an oath allowable.

(1) Hence the title Jerubbaal, LXX. Ἱεροβάαλ, by which he is also mentioned 1 Sam. xii. 11, and which is exchanged, 2 Sam. xi. 21, for Jerubbesheth, יְרֻבֶּשֶׁת = בֹּשֶׁת, a contemptuous name of the idol, was bestowed upon Gideon. The word, according to Judg. vi. 32, can in the first instance be no otherwise interpreted than as, "Let Baal contend," *i.e.* against him. For further discussion on this name, see the article *Gideon* in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* v. p. 151; comp. also Hengstenberg, *Beitr.* ii. p. 213 sq.; Movers, *Phönicier*, i. p. 128 sqq.

(2) See Hengstenberg, *Beitr.* iii. p. 97, and Bertheau's *Commentary on the Book of Judges*, p. 133. The latter acts arbitrarily, however, in making Gideon at the same time set up the image of a calf, as was subsequently done by Jeroboam. For why may not Gideon have worshipped Jehovah by means of the altar mentioned Judg. vi. 24, and still standing in the days of the narrator, without an image?

(3) We are not told whether the sacred garment was worn by Gideon as a priest, or set up as an object of worship. The former seems probable.

(4) Gideon's sin was visited upon his house, when his sons

Digitized by Google

were afterwards slain by their half-brother Abimelech in the place of his illegal worship. The tragic fate of Gideon's family is related Judg. ix.

(5) The case of the Gibeonites (Josh. ix.), when the people dared not even break an oath opposed to a Divine injunction, may be mentioned in illustration.

II.—RESTORATION OF THE THEOCRATIC UNITY BY SAMUEL. GROWTH OF PROPHETISM. FOUNDATION OF THE MONARCHY.

§ 160.

The Philistine Oppression. Changes effected by Samuel.

The appearance of *Samuel*, and the growth of Prophetism by his means, forms the *turning-point of the period of the Judges.* The new state of affairs had been *prepared for*, partly by the Philistine oppression, which was both a longer and a heavier judgment than any with which the people had yet been visited, partly by the judgeship of Eli. For the judgeship depending in his case not upon a successfully-conducted war or on any other act of heroism, but upon the high-priestly office, the sanctuary could not fail to acquire fresh importance, and consequently the theocratic union fresh power with the people. Their first attempt, however, to break the Philistine yoke in united battle, ended in a fearful overthrow, in which even the ark, which had so often led them to victory, fell into the hands of the enemy, 1 Sam. iv. The oppression of the Philistines then became still more grievous, for it is evident, from xiii. 19–22, that they disarmed the entire nation. The fact that the ark of the covenant, the medium of Jehovah's help and presence, should have fallen into the hands of the heathen, could not fail to exercise an important influence upon the religious consciousness of the people. The ark, after being restored by the Philistines, was for a long time laid aside: "it was not in-

Digitized by Google

quired after," 1 Chron. xiii. 13 (comp. Ps. cxxxii. 6); it continued an object of fear, but not of worship (1). The *tabernacle* was transferred from Shiloh, as a place now rejected of God, to Nob in the tribe of Benjamin; but, having lost with the ark its essential significance as the place of God's habitation, it ceased to be the religious centre of the nation, though, as we may infer from 1 Sam. xxi. and xxii. 17 sqq., the Levitical services were carried on in it without interruption. The person of Samuel, impelled as he was by the prophetic spirit, was now the centre of the nation's vitality. The sanctuary being rejected, and the agency of the high-priesthood suspended, the mediatorship between God and His people rested with the prophet, who, though not of the priestly race, but by descent a Levite of the region of Ephraim (2), now performed sacrificial services in the presence of the people (1 Sam. vii. 9 sqq.). The central sanctuary no longer existing, we now also find various places of sacrifice, as the high places at Ramah, 1 Sam. ix. 13, Bethel and Gilgal, x. 3 sq., comp. xi. 15, xv. 21. Thus were the bounds imposed by the Mosaic ritual for the first time broken through. Israel attained to the experience that the presence of God is not confined to an appointed and sensible symbol, but that wherever He is sincerely invoked, He bestows His abundant blessing. The day of penitence and prayer for which Samuel assembled the people at Mizpah, in the tribe of Benjamin, after he had put down idolatry, became, by the help of Jehovah, who acknowledged the prayer of His prophet, a day of victory over their enemies, and the beginning of their deliverance (ch. vii.). Samuel was henceforth judge of the whole nation; and the prophetic office began from this time to develope its agency, on which account the history of Prophetism, properly speaking, dates from Samuel (Acts iii. 24).

(1) 1 Sam. xiv. 18, where, moreover, the LXX. assume a different reading, treats of an exception, which is alluded to as such.

(2) Samuel was, according to 1 Chron. vi. 13, 18, of the

Digitized by Google

house of Kohath. His father is called אֶפְרָתִי, in the same sense as the Levite in Judg. xvii. 7 is said to be of the family of Judah. The frequent occurrence of the name of Samuel's father Elkanah among the Levitical proper names, especially among the Korahites, Ex. vi. 24, 1 Chron. vi. 7 sq., xii. 6, 9, xv. 23, is remarkable (see Hengstenberg, *Beitr.* iii. p. 61). This name, like its kindred one Mikneiah, 1 Chron. xv. 18, 21, points to the office of the Levites. The fact that Samuel was devoted to the service of the sanctuary by a special vow, proves nothing against his Levitical descent, because without this vow such service was not binding on him till he should be twenty-five years of age; and even Levites were not obliged to remain constantly at the sanctuary (Art. *Levi, Levites*).

§ 161.

Nature, Importance, and first Beginnings of the Prophetic Office (1).

The position occupied by the *prophetic office* in the organism of the theocracy has already been generally referred to, § 97; we must now treat more particularly of its institution and duties, in which respect also our point of departure must be the fundamental passage Deut. xviii. 9–21. The character of the prophetic, differed entirely from that of the priestly office. It was not, like the latter, confined to one tribe and one family, nor, generally speaking, to an external institution, though a certain external succession subsequently took place. It is said, ver. 15, "the Lord will *raise up* (יָקִים) a prophet,"—an expression used also of the judges, Judg. ii. 16, 18, iii. 9, 15, etc., and denoting the freeness of the Divine vocation; and again, "*from the midst of thee*, of thy brethren" (comp. Deut. xviii. 18), showing that the call to the office of prophet was to know no other restriction than that of being confined to the covenant people. This office, however, was not to be severed from the historical connection of revelation, but to begin from

Digitized by Google

Moses and continue his testimony (vers. 15, 18) (2). The prophet was to prove his Divine mission, not so much by signs and wonders—for the performance of which even a false prophet might receive power—as by his confession of the God who redeemed Israel and gave them the law (xiii. 2–6). Again, what the prophet spoke was to *come to pass* (יָבֹא); that is, the prophetic word was to be corroborated by its historical fulfilment. In the first respect, the prophetic office, while itself exercised within the unalterable ordinances of the law, was designed to prevent a mere lifeless transmission of legal injunctions, by proclaiming to the people the demands of the Divine will in a manner constantly adapted to the needs of the age, and in all the life and vigour of a message ever newly coming forth from God. In the second respect, it was to cast a light on the future of the people, and to disclose to them the Divine counsels, whether for their warning or comfort (comp. Amos iii. 7), and thus to initiate them in the ways of the Divine government. In this particular also it might be regarded as continuing the testimony of the law, which not only revealed God's requirements to His people, but also manifested the law of His procedure towards them, and the end of His government, Lev. xxvi., Deut. xxviii.–xxx., xxxii. (3). God's witness to Himself among heathen nations is more a matter of the past, a subject of remembrance; in prophecy, on the contrary, a lasting and lively intercourse is established between God and the covenant people, on which account the silence of prophecy is a sign that the Lord has withdrawn from His people, and therefore a sign of judgment (comp. Amos viii. 12, Lam. ii. 9, Ps. lxxiv. 9). But the progress accomplished by revelation in prophecy will not be fully discerned, till the prophetic life and that *endowment with the Spirit* which constituted a prophet are taken account of, as well as the prophetic word itself. The prophet is the man of the Spirit. By the רוּחַ יְהוָה is the Divine word put into the mouth of the prophet, hence also his name נָבִיא. The root נָבָא is akin to נָבַע, which (comp.

Digitized by Google

also נוּב, נָבַךְ) signifies to spring forth, to gush forth, the Hiphil הִבִּיעַ being used of speech flowing forth from a full heart. נָבִיא then means, not, as it is now usually explained, that which is spoken (or more precisely, gushed forth) by the Divine Spirit, but (see Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrbuch*, § 149 *e*, 2) the speaker —yet not in an active sense, but, as is shown by the passive form, him who is the speaker as the instrument of another, viz. God. The נָבִיא is the interpreter (comp. Ex. vii. 1: "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy נָבִיא," which is expressed iv. 16: "he shall be to thee for a mouth"); hence the speech of the prophet, as being determined by the spiritual power which fills and incites him, is designated by the passive or reflective forms Niphal and Hithpael נִבָּא, הִתְנַבֵּא (comp. Ewald, *id.* § 124 *a*). Among those spiritual gifts by which Jehovah fits men for the different callings which the service of His kingdom requires (comp. § 65), the gift of prophecy is that which institutes a direct personal intercourse between God and man; and prophecy thus becomes, through God's self-witness to the prophet, the type of the teaching of His people by God Himself under the new covenant, Jer. xxxi. 34, John vi. 45. The operation of the Divine Spirit, however, upon the prophet, was not merely intellectual, but one which renewed the whole man. The prophet became another man, 1 Sam. x. 6, and received another heart, ver. 9. Thus prophecy was also an anticipation of the *καινὴ κτίσις* of the new covenant,—a circumstance which explains the saying of Moses, Num. xi. 29: "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!" (4).

The first beginnings of prophecy reach back to the times before Samuel (comp. Jer. vii. 25). For Moses, though standing far above all prophets (Num. xii. 6–8, comp. § 66) as mediator of the fundamental revelation and administrator of the entire Divine economy, as well as by reason of that nearer vision of God vouchsafed to him as a special

Digitized by Google

privilege, was himself a prophet (comp. Deut. xxxiv. 10, Hos. xii. 14), and that not merely in the broader sense in which the word נָבִיא was already applied to the patriarchs (Gen. xx. 7, Ps. cv. 15), because the word of God came to and proceeded from them, but in its proper signification, as partaking of that endowment of the Spirit which constitutes a prophet (Num. xi. 25) (5). As well as Moses, his sister Miriam is also called, Ex. xv. 20, נְבִיאָה, which must not be explained as singer (or poet), for she expressly claims (Num. xii. 2) the honour that the Lord had spoken by her (6). In the earlier times of the judges, the gift of prophecy appeared but occasionally; in the person of Deborah, who is called (Judg. iv. 4) the prophetess because (vers. 6 and 14) the word of the Lord came by her, it was united to the office of judge. By the מַלְאַךְ־יְהוָה, ii. 1, we must probably understand not a human messenger, but the angel of the Lord. On the other hand, it is a prophet who appears, xi. 7, during the Midianite oppression, to remind the Israelites of their deliverance from Egypt, and to reprove them for their idolatry. In like manner does a "man of God" (1 Sam. ii. 27) exercise the office of a rebuker of the high priest Eli and his family, entirely in the manner of the later prophets. There must also, as may be inferred from ix. 9, have been from time to time seers (רֹאֶה, as they were usually called, instead of נָבִיא), with whom counsel was taken in private affairs, but of whom a more extensive sphere of operation cannot be assumed. It cannot be proved from Amos ii. 11 that the schools of the prophets existed before Samuel, as has been conjectured, *e.g.* by Vatke (*Religion des alten Testaments*, p. 285 sqq.); nor from the fact that Samuel was a Nazarite as well as a prophet (7), that prophecy being thus combined with Nazaritism, these schools of the prophets existed in the form of ascetic associations, into which many retired during those troublous times. This absence of proof is increased by the manner in which the period preceding Samuel is characterized, 1 Sam. iii. 1, as one devoid of prophets, by the words:

Digitized by Google

"The word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was no open vision."

(1) See my article *Prophetenthum des A. T.* in Herzog's *Real-encyclop.* xii. p. 211 sqq. A notice of the literature on the prophetic office in general, is given in Keil's *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einl. ins A. T.* sec. ii. p. 192.

(2) The prophet, however, receives, like Moses, the word of the Lord directly, and is therefore not the disciple of Moses, but לְמוּד יְהוָה (§ 205), the immediate instrument of Jehovah.

(3) In both respects, prophecy is one of the highest proofs of favour which God shows to His people, and is placed on a level (Amos ii. 11, Hos. xii. 10 sq.) with their deliverance from Egypt and their subsequent leading through the wilderness.

(4) It is for this very reason that that outpouring of the Spirit which calls into existence the future church of the redeemed, in which all are directly taught of God and bear His law within them as a sanctifying vital power (Jer. xxxi. 34), is represented as a universal bestowal of the gift of prophecy (Joel iii. 1). These general propositions will be further carried out in the subsequent didactic section (§ 205 sqq.).

(5) If the history of the Old Testament revelation advances from theophany to inspiration (comp. § 55), the latter as well as the former is already found in Moses.

(6) Joshua, whom the son of Sirach, xlvi. 1, designates as διάδοχος Μωσῆ ἐν προφητείαις, is never called נָבִיא.

(7) This much only can be said, that Nazaritism may have become more widely diffused in the period of the judges by the examples of Samuel and Samson. The commotions of the times may have the more powerfully induced individuals, by undertaking this vow, to present to the people the image of their sacred and priestly destination. The expression, Amos ii. 11, "I raised up," etc., as well as what is said ver. 12, points to the contrast in which such God-devoted persons stood to the mass of the people.

Digitized by Google

§ 162.

The so-called Schools of the Prophets. The Prophetic Office of Watchman.

In the times of *Samuel*, on the contrary, a greater number of prophets appear, in consequence of the powerful spiritual movement by which the nation was affected. These gathered round Samuel, and formed the so-called *schools of the prophets*. These institutions, concerning which every possible theory has been subsequently held, have been regarded by some as monastic brotherhoods, by others as secret societies, by others—and this view, expressed in their ordinary designation as schools of the prophets, is the most widely spread—as educational establishments (1). They make their appearance at only two periods of Israelite history, viz. in the days of Samuel, and in the kingdom of the ten tribes in the times of Elijah and Elisha (2). The purpose of these schools of the prophets, and apparently their arrangements being very different under Samuel and in the days of Elijah, the two accounts must be considered separately.

We first meet with (1 Sam. x. 5–12) a number (חֶבֶל, properly a band) of prophets coming with instruments of music from the high place (בָּמָה) of Gibeah in the tribe of Benjamin, and prophesying (3). It is not said that these prophets had also a dwelling at this high place; they seem rather to have been journeying to the place of worship found there (Thenius, *in loc.*, thinks otherwise). We next find, xix. 19 sqq., an assembly (לַהֲקָה) of prophets prophesying, with Samuel at their head, at Ramah in נָיֶת (Keri נָיוֹת), *i.e.* dwellings, which expression denotes a place of residence consisting of several habitations, and consequently a college of prophets (4). There is no reason for supposing a *school* properly so called. The prophetic gift was not to be engendered by instruction (it was not the product of study and reflection, but the immediate effect of

Digitized by Google

the Divine Spirit). It must also be noticed that *prophets* (נְבִיאִים) assembled around Samuel are here spoken of, not, as subsequently, sons of the prophets, בְּנֵי נְבִיאִים,—an expression denoting disciples of the prophets (comp. § 174). By this assembly of prophets, then, we understand rather an association of prophets drawn together by the leading of the Spirit, and among whom the prophetic gift was cherished by sacred exercises performed in common. This view of the matter leads us to infer that Samuel desired, in those days when the sanctuary, deprived of the ark, was no longer the central point of the theocracy, to found here a home for the newly kindled religious life of the nation. The extraordinary manifestations in which the prophetic inspiration displayed itself, and the overwhelming and irresistible influence it exercised on all who came within its circle, are common to this first appearance of prophecy, and to the early vigour of kindred spiritual movements (5). There is not a hint that the association of prophets at Ramah consisted chiefly, as some have supposed, of Levites, no privileges of birth being in this respect of any avail,—a circumstance alluded to x. 12 (6). Nor can it be legitimately inferred that the cultivation of vocal and instrumental music was a direct end of this union, musicians being in fact distinguished, ver. 10, from prophets. Music was designed, on the one hand, to prepare the mind for the apprehension of the Divine voice (comp. 2 Kings iii. 15); on the other, to be a vehicle for the utterance of the prophetic inspiration (7). That *sacred literature* was also cherished in this association at Ramah, may be regarded as certain, for prophetic authorship undoubtedly begins with Samuel,—at first, indeed, in the form of theocratic history (8). (For lack of further information, nothing more can be said concerning the internal arrangements of the schools of the prophets, or, to speak more correctly, of the association of the prophets in Samuel's time, for the existence of any other college than that at Ramah cannot be proved.) The public and powerful agency exercised from this time forward by

Digitized by Google

those who filled the prophetic office, shows that a contemplative life passed in seclusion from the world was out of the question for those who were members of the association of prophets. This agency, after Samuel had founded the kingdom, and delivered up to the king the authority he had exercised as judge, may be defined as that of watchmen to the theocracy, whence the prophets are frequently designated צֹפִים or מְצַפִּים (comp. Mic. vii. 4; Jer. vi. 17; Ezek. iii. 17, xxxiii. 7). This office of watchman, moreover, was to be exercised both towards the nation in general and the holders of theocratic offices in particular, especially the king, whose conduct could not on theocratic principles be inspected and controlled by the representatives of the people, but only by the immediate agents of Jehovah. To try the ways of the nation and its leaders by their conformity to the injunctions of the Divine covenant (comp. as the principal passage Jer. vi. 27)—to insist with inexorable severity upon the dignity and sole sovereignty of Jehovah—to testify unreservedly before high and low, and especially before the theocratic office-bearers, against every declension from Him and from His law—to proclaim the Divine judgments against the obdurately disobedient, and to be in some circumstances themselves the executioners thereof, on the other hand, to promise, when needful, deliverance and blessing, such were the duties which constituted the political agency of the prophets,—an agency which must be classed neither with that of ministers and councillors of state, nor with that of popular leaders and demagogues, in the fashion in which it has often been attempted to draw a comparison between them. One duty pertaining to this office of watchman was that of *writing the theocratic history*, whose object it was to portray, in the light of the Divine counsels and of the inviolable ordinance of Divine retribution, the manner in which Israel had hitherto been led—to pass judgment on the past condition of the people, and especially on the life and conduct of their kings, according to the standard of the law—to point out by

Digitized by Google

their fate the reality of the Divine threats and promises; and in all these ways to hold up, for the warning and comfort of future generations, the mirror of the history of their forefathers, the so-called "theocratic pragmatism" (9).

(1) Compare on this subject especially Keil's *Commentary on the Books of Samuel*, 1864, § 146 sqq. There is scarcely any subject of Old Testament history and theology which could formerly boast of having excited so large a share of interest and investigation as the so-called schools of the prophets. The less was known of them, the more might be made of them, and hence every one saw in them what he wanted to see. The copious literature to which they have given rise is recorded in Kranichfeld's *De iis, quæ in V. T. commemorantur, prophetarum societatibus*, 1861, p. 2. On the one hand, Jerome, the reverer of monasticism, sees in them the earliest monasteries (see the passages to this effect in Vitringa, *de synag. vet.* ed. 2, p. 351); on the other, the Rabbinists regard them as בָּתֵּי־מִדְרָשׁ (see the notices in Alting's *historia academiarum hebræarum* in the Academical Dissertations in the fifth volume of his works, p. 242 sqq.). In like manner, most moderns have looked upon them as kinds of colleges, in which were found, as Vitringa, *id.* p. 350, expresses it, *philosophi et theologi et theologiæ candidati scientiæ rerum divinarum sedulo incumbentes sub ductu unius alicujus doctoris.* So, too, does Hering (*Abhandlung von den Schulen der Propheten*, 1777, p. 34 sq.) designate them as schools for the purpose of educating skilful instructors of the people, fit superintendents of public worship, and upright overseers of the church; saying that matters were there expounded which it was necessary, according to the notions of the times, for the future teacher, priest, or Levite to know, for the due discharge of his official duties. Hering opposes this view especially to the *Deists*, who, regarding the prophets of the Old Testament chiefly as freethinkers, choose also to view the schools of the prophets in the same light. According *e.g.* to Morgan, they were not merely seats of scientific illuminism, in which history, rhetoric, poetry, natural science, and above all, moral philosophy were studied, but they specially subserved the purposes of political opposition (comp.

Digitized by Google

Lechler, *Gesch. des engl. Deismus*, p. 380 sq.; Hering, *id.* p. 21). Moderns have, after the precedent of Tennemann, compared them to the Pythagorean association; while others, on the contrary, have regarded them as singing academies. The latest advocate of the view which looks upon them as educational establishments properly so called, is Herzfeld (*Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. p. 4). According to him, Samuel is said to have instructed the young in the pure idea of Jahveh and the history of their native land, with the twofold purpose of making the majority enlightened believers in Jahveh, who, returning to their respective domestic circles, would there exercise a very salutary influence, and of educating the more gifted for actual prophets. (Article *Prophetenthum des A. T.*)

(2) On the latter, see the history of the kingdom of the ten tribes, § 174.

(3) Saul, who met them when sent by Samuel, was himself affected by the power of the prophetic spirit, and began to prophesy.

(4) In this assembly, also, first the messengers of Saul and then himself were affected by the prophetic spirit,—a fact manifested in the case of the latter by a convulsive state.

(5) Similar extraordinary phenomena are recorded also of the oldest Christian churches, especially the Corinthian (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 24); the Camisards and other phenomena of ecclesiastical history may here be mentioned.

(6) In the very variously understood passage, 1 Sam. x. 12, the words "who is their father?" can hardly be taken to mean "who is their president?" which would here be a very idle inquiry. They are rather to be regarded as a retort to the astonished inquiry of ver. 11, "what is come to the son of Kish?" which they answer by the question, "who then is *their* father?" *i.e.* have they then the gift of prophecy in virtue of a privilege of birth?

(7) It is, however, undoubtedly probable that the cultivation of sacred music by the prophets mainly contributed to the impulse given to it from the time of David, who was closely connected with the association of prophets at Ramah, and even, according to 1 Sam. xix. 18, himself sojourned there for a time. There is so close a connection between sacred song and prophecy, that the former is itself called prophesying, 1 Chron.

Digitized by Google

xxv. 2 sq.; and the chief singers appointed by David (xxv. 1, 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 30, xxxv. 15) are called prophets and seers. (Art. *Pädagogik des A. T.*)

(8) Comp. 1 Chron. xxix. 29, and what Thenius, on 1 Sam. xix. 19, xxii. 5, remarks on the traces of sketches of the life of David made in the schools of the prophets. The foundations of that great historical work composed during successive centuries by the prophets, so frequently appealed to as an authority in the Books of Kings, and still extant, though re-compiled, in the time of the chronicler, may have been already laid. With respect to the disputed question—which cannot in this place be further gone into—as to the relation of the writings quoted in the Books of Chronicles under the names of prophets (the words of the seer Samuel, of the prophet Nathan, of the seer Gad, the prophecy of Ahijah, the vision of Ye'di, the words of the prophet Shemaiah, of Iddo the seer, the writing of Isaiah, etc.) to the above-mentioned annals, it seems to me that the former must have been in the hands of the chronicler not as separate writings, but as component parts of the latter great work, which is expressly stated to have been the case with the writings of the prophets Jehu and Isaiah, 2 Chron. xx. 34, xxxii. 32. The theory of Movers and others, however, that individual portions of the Books of Kings are designated in Chronicles by the names of prophets, as above cited, only because narratives concerning the prophets in question occur in them, is unnatural. Far rather does the chronicler, as he unmistakeably says, 2 Chron. xxvi. 22, with respect to the history of Uzziah by Isaiah, regard the books on which his own work is founded as the actual compositions of prophets. The connection between the writing of history and the prophetic call will become more evident as we proceed.

(9) An expression quite harmless in itself, yet capable of leading to a total misconception if the view of history imparted to the prophets in virtue of that spiritual vision which disclosed to them the connection of things, is said to be the result of a talent for so representing events as to accommodate history to subjective tendencies.

Digitized by Google

§ 163.

The Foundation of the Israelite Kingdom. Consecration of the King (1).

We have already glanced at the duty made incumbent on those who filled the office of prophets, by *the foundation of the Israelite kingdom.* This came to pass in the following manner. In spite of the mutual jealousies of the different tribes, among which that of Ephraim laid special claim to superiority (comp. Judg. viii. 1, xii. 1), the tribulation experienced during the times of the judges had made the people conscious of their need of a national union, by which the several tribes might be bound together. The royal dignity, with hereditary succession, had already been offered to Gideon, and refused by him on theocratic principles, Judg. viii. 23 (2). After his death, a kingdom was set up "over Israel," ix. 22, in Shechem, by his illegitimate son Abimelech, which, however, extended to only a portion of the nation, and lasted but three years. The people having at last experienced under Samuel the advantages of national unity, and fearing the dangers still threatening them from east and west (in the first place from the Ammonites, but also, comp. ix. 16, still from the Philistines), and at the same time apprehensive of the tyranny of Samuel's sons, expressed still more strongly their desire for a king, on whom the command of the army and the administration of justice might regularly devolve,—a king "like all the nations," viii. 5, 20. This request, in the sense in which it was made to Samuel, was a denial of the sovereignty of Jehovah, a renunciation of their own glory as the theocratic people, and a misconception of the power and faithfulness of the covenant God, inasmuch as a faulty constitution, and not their own departure from God and His law, was regarded as the cause of the misfortunes they had hitherto experienced; while their hope of a better future was therefore founded upon the institution of an

Digitized by Google

earthly government, and not upon the return of the people to their God. Hence the Divine answer, viii. 7, "they have rejected *me* that I should not reign over them." On the other hand, however, as the Divine providence does not exclude the employment of human agents as its instruments, so neither was an earthly kingdom of necessity opposed to the theocracy; nay, since the people had shown themselves incapable of uniting in an ideal union, the kingship might—if the king, in obedience to the theocratic principle, were regarded not as an autocrat but as the organ of Jehovah—even become the means of confirming the theocracy. It was on this principle that Samuel acted, after having obtained God's permission to grant the desire of the people. To make it evident that the Divine choice was entirely independent of earthly considerations, it was not a man of importance, but one as yet unknown, of the least family of the smallest of the tribes (ix. 21), who was raised to the throne (3). The consecration to the kingship was effected, according to ancient and already assumed (Judg. ix. 8, 15) usage, by *anointing*, a rite performed by Samuel on Saul, 1 Sam. x. 1, and subsequently on David, xvi. 3, and repeated in the case of the latter after his actual entrance upon the government, 2 Sam. ii. 4, v. 3, by the elders of the people. The royal anointing is also mentioned in the cases of Absalom, xix. 11; Solomon, 1 Kings i. 39 (by the high priest); Joash, 2 Kings ix. 12; Jehoahaz, xxiii. 80; and in the kingdom of the ten tribes, in that of Jehu, who was raised to the throne by the instrumentality of a prophet. The anointing of a king is nowhere else spoken of,—a circumstance which has given support to the rabbinic view, that this rite was only practised at the elevation of a new dynasty, or when an exceptional case of succession occurred, but omitted when the succession was regular (4). If this view is correct, anointing must be regarded as a rite whose efficacy continued as long as the regular succession to the throne was uninterrupted. And this is undoubtedly consistent with the Old Testament notion of the connection of the

Digitized by Google

dynasty with its founder,—מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה, the Lord's anointed, being the usual designation of the theocratic king (comp. such passages as Ps. xx. 7, xxviii. 10, lxxxix. 39, 52, etc.) (5). Anointing was a symbol of endowment with the Divine Spirit (comp. 1 Sam. x. 1 in connection with ver. 9 sq., xvi. 13), the gift which is the condition of a wise, just, and powerful government,—all ability to rule righteously being but an outflow of Divine wisdom (Prov. viii. 15 sq.) (6). Anointing made the king's person both sacred and inviolable (1 Sam. xxiv. 7, xxvi. 9, compared with 2 Sam. ix. 22) (7). In Saul's case, his institution in the regal functions, by his public presentation before the assembled people, 1 Sam. x. 20 sqq., on which occasion Samuel announced to them "the manner of the kingdom," and wrote it in a book which was laid up before the Lord, *i.e.* deposited with the Thorah in the sanctuary, did not take place till after his consecration. What Samuel explained to the people as the manner of the king, viii. 11 sqq., is not intended here, as the passage has so frequently been misunderstood, for the latter would have been that of a king in the sense in which the people desired, "like the kings of the heathen nations" (8). We afterwards find, 2 Kings xi. 12, that a copy of the law was, in accordance with the injunction Deut. xvii. 18 sq., presented to the king together with the crown. Saul having by a victorious war obtained the recognition of the people (ch. xi.), Samuel retired from the office of judge, to execute from henceforth only the duties of prophet, and of watchman of the theocracy.

(1) See my article *Könige Königthum in Israel* in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* viii. p. 10 sq.

(2) Judg. viii. 23: "I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you: the Lord shall rule over you."

(3) A similar mode of proceeding was observed at the choice of David, 1 Sam. xvi. 7, comp. with 2 Sam. vii. 8, 18, Ps. lxxviii. 70.

(4) Comp. the still very useful work of Schickard, *jus regium*

Digitized by Google

Hebræorum c. animadvers. J. B. Carpzovii, 1674, p. 77; J. G. Carpzov, *app. hist. crit. ant. sacr.* p. 56.

(5) On the question whether at a royal anointing ordinary oil or the priestly anointing oil was employed, a question to which the Old Testament offers no certain answer, see Carpzov, *id.* The former view is favoured by 1 Kings i. 39, Ps. lxxxix. 21. It must also be remarked that יָצַק, the standing expression for the anointing of the high priest (see § 96), is sometimes also used of the royal anointing, 1 Sam. x. 1; 2 Kings ix. 3.

(6) Compare the description of Messiah, the ideal of Israelite kingship, in Isa. xi. 1 sqq.

(7) Other ceremonies seem to have been combined with anointing, especially that of placing on the king's head the *crown-diadem*, נֵזֶר, 2 Kings xi. 12, as the token of royal dignity, 2 Sam. i. 10; Ps. lxxxix. 40, cxxxii. 18. The king did not wear both diadem *and* crown; but the crown was probably not of the shape now used, but rather a diadem. מִצְנֶפֶת, in Ezek. xxi. 31, as everywhere, is the head-gear, not, as Gesenius supposes, of the king, but of the high priest. See on this subject Hengstenberg, *Christol. des A. T.* ii. sec. 2, p. 566. The other royal insignia, the sceptre, instead of which Saul seems to have borne a lance (1 Sam. xviii. 10, xxii. 6), the throne, etc., need no further mention.

(8) Neither, however, can a constitution in the modern sense of the word, or a compact between ruler and people, be supposed.

SECOND DIVISION.

PERIOD OF THE UNDIVIDED KINGDOM.

I. SAUL.

§ 164.

The history of Israel during the time of the undivided kingdom is separated by the reigns of its three monarchs into three sections, essentially differing in character.

Digitized by Google

The reign of Saul at once displays the kingdom in conflict with the theocratic principle advocated by the prophets. Saul fell a victim to his efforts to render the kingdom independent, though at the commencement of his reign he seems undoubtedly to have supported the reforming zeal of Samuel, by his extermination of necromancy (1 Sam. xxviii. 9). He regarded his royal duties chiefly, however, on their *warlike* side, which the dangers constantly menacing him on the part of the Philistines never suffered him to lose sight of (1 Sam. xiii. 8–14) (1). That his submission to the prophet was not unlimited, was shown by even the first test imposed upon him by Samuel, viz. that of waiting seven days before the sacrifice (1 Sam. xiii. 8–14, compared with x. 8), on which account Samuel announced to him that his kingdom should not endure (2). Ignoring, nevertheless, the evident consistency with which the prophet treated him, and transgressing his command for the second time after his victorious contest with the Amalekites, ch. xv., against whom he failed to execute the *Cherem*, the Divine sentence of rejection was immediately pronounced against him. The answer then given by Samuel, ver. 22 sq., to the king, when he sought to palliate his disobedience, contains what may be called the programme of prophetship, which, as the office of the Spirit, was to censure all hypocrisy, and to advocate, in opposition to all self-righteousness, the sole supremacy of the Divine will (3). In the execution of his office, the prophet was not permitted to yield to that human sympathy with which Samuel personally felt for Saul (see xv. 11, xvi. 1). From this time forward Saul was gradually but certainly approaching the consummation of his tragic fate. Samuel anointed the shepherd David, the youngest son of Jesse, a descendant of Ruth the Moabitess,—who, as a convert from heathenism, had been incorporated into the covenant people (Ruth iv. 22),—king in his stead. Samuel seems after this to have retired into the seclusion of the association of prophets at Ramah. The prophets held no further intercourse with

Digitized by Google

Saul: David was now in their eyes the lawful king, and with him, as appears from 1 Sam. xxii. 5, they associated as far as practicable (4). Saul, however, utterly consumed his strength in persecuting David and all whom he regarded as his adherents. His whole existence was embittered by suspicion of those about him, till at length the unhappy king, after seeking counsel from the shades of the dead, and receiving as a sentence from the mouth of the departed, that prophetic testimony which he had despised when announced by the living, perished by his own hand, after an unsuccessful battle against the Philistines (5).

(1) 1 Sam. xiv. 52: "When Saul saw any strong man, or any valiant man, he took him unto him."

(2) I cannot here enter into particulars; comp. the elucidation of this point in Ewald's *Geschichte Israels*, i. sec. 2, p. 477 sqq., iii. sec. 3, p. 41 sqq., and the whole of his excellent treatment of the reign of Saul, which is one of the best portions of this work.

(3) 1 Sam. xv. 22 sq.: "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams: for rebellion is the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, He hath also rejected thee from being king."

(4) The prophet Gad, mentioned 1 Sam. xxii. 5, and subsequently reappearing in the history of David, was probably a member of the association of prophets at Ramah.

(5) The narrative in the First Book of Samuel, of Saul's gradual accomplishment of his tragic fate after being forsaken by God, and the Books of Samuel in general, are the most complete portion of Old Testament history; while the vivid and graphic descriptions, and the sharpness and delicacy with which the chief characters are portrayed, are excellent even in an artistic point of view. On the subject last mentioned, comp. especially the article *Die Geschichte von der Zauberin in Endor* in the *Erlanger Zeitschrift für Protest. und Kirche*, 1851, Sep-

Digitized by Google

tember, p. 133 sqq. Saul is therein very justly characterized as of "a demoniac nature, quickly rushing from one extreme to another, enthusiastic in pleasure, deeply depressed in sorrow, and finally sinking beneath the waves of despair."

II. DAVID.

§ 165.

History of his Reign, his Theocratic Position and Personal Religious Development.

It was only by the tribe of Judah, to which he belonged, that David was at first acknowledged king. The other tribes still adhered to the house of Saul; and even after the murder of Ishbosheth, the son of Saul, this division of the state continued for several years. Not till after David had reigned seven and a half years in Hebron did he receive the submission of all Israel, in a form in which the theocratic principle is expressly recognised (2 Sam. v. 2 sqq.) (1). Thus began the powerful reign of David, during which, by a series of successful wars, he rendered the kingdom of Israel not only independent of external oppression, but also extended its northern and eastern boundary to the Euphrates, and raised himself to a position of power which inspired other nations with fear (comp. Ps. xviii. 44). Thus is the kingship of David a type of the kingdom of God which overcomes the world (2). Israel, however, as the people of God, was not to realize its vocation to the rulership of the world, which is indeed the aim of the theocracy (Ps. ii.), in the way of a conquering secular state; hence the condemnation of that numbering of the people instituted by David (2 Sam. xxiv.; 1 Chron. xxi.), which was probably designed to lead to the complete military organization of the nation (3). This occurrence, in which the prophet Gad was conspicuous, and the appearance of Nathan in the well-known case (2 Sam. xii.), show that the prophets were mindful

Digitized by Google

of their office as watchmen and reprovers of the king, even under David (4). In general, however, we now see *the two offices exercised harmoniously.* For David was himself filled with the idea of a theocratic ruler: his life and acts were founded on the one thought of being found as the servant of Jehovah, the God who had chosen him and taken him from the sheepfolds to feed His people (Ps. lxxviii. 70–72). This is testified by several of his psalms,—by that mirror of kings, Ps. ci., in which he portrays a sovereign as a righteous judge, and the song of thanksgiving, Ps. xviii., which, after being victorious over all his enemies, he sang unto the God who had girded him with strength for the conflict, and subdued the nations under him (5). The union of the kingship with the Divine rulership, in virtue of which the king was settled in Jehovah's house and kingdom, 1 Chron. xvii. 14 ("I will settle him in *my* house and in *my* kingdom"),—sat upon the throne of the kingdom of Jehovah, xxviii. 5, xxix. 23 (more briefly: "upon the throne of God"),—was effected even externally when the hill of Zion, which after the conquest of Jerusalem had been chosen as the seat of government, was also made the seat of the sanctuary by the installation of the ark of the covenant (2 Sam. vi.), which was now again brought out of concealment. For although sacrificial services were still performed in the old tabernacle, which was at the high place at Gibeon (1 Chron. xvi. 37–42, comp. 2 Chron. i. 3 sqq.), the hill of Zion, as the dwelling-place of Jehovah, Ps. ix. 12, lxxiv. 2, lxxvi. 3, lxxviii. 68, was from this time forth the centre of the theocracy. Thence proceeded, according to Ps. iii. 5, xx. 3, cx. 2, and other passages, the manifestations of God's grace and power; while every hope of the glorification and perfection of the Divine kingdom was united to Jerusalem, the city of God, xlvi. 5, the city of the great King, xlviii. 3, whose foundations were upon the holy hills, lxxxvii. 1, which, in its strong, retired, and protected situation, was itself a symbol of the church of God, cxxv. 1 sq., and of which all the nations of the earth

Digitized by Google

should one day receive the rights of citizenship, Ps. lxxxvii. (6). The kingship, as administered by David, appears neither as a necessary evil nor an improved constitution, but as a new ethic potency. In its king, Israel itself attains to a consciousness of its national power, hence the king becomes also the representative of the people; and the idea of *Divine sonship*, which in the first place appertains to the people, is transferred to him (7) Kingship in the person of David (and relatively in that of Solomon) exhibits also a certain measure of the priestly character; for David appeared for the people before the Lord with sacrifices and intercessions, and brought back to them the Lord's blessing, 2 Sam. vi. 18 (8). It is a peculiarity of David to unite in himself, as Moses and Samuel had already to a certain degree done, the three theocratic dignities; for the gift of *prophecy* was also bestowed on him, the Spirit of God spoke by him, and the words of God were on his tongue, 2 Sam. xxxiii. 2. Of the greatest importance, however, is the choice of David to be, in the persons of his descendants, *the permanent holder of the theocratic kingship*, in virtue of that Divine promise delivered to him by Nathan, which forms a new stage in the history of the kingdom of God. When David had rest from his enemies round about him, he announced to the prophet Nathan his intention of building a temple as a permanent dwelling-place for the Lord. Nathan at first agreed with him, but received in the night direction from God to bid David renounce this undertaking, on account, as we are told 1 Chron. xxii. 8, xxviii. 3, of the blood which, as a warrior, he had shed. It seemed inconsistent with Divine decorum that this work of peace should be executed by hands so defiled with blood. That son of David whom God had chosen to be His son was to be permitted to accomplish it. On the other hand, God promised to build David a house, to bestow the kingship on his seed for ever, and though chastisements might not be omitted, never to withdraw His favour from him (see the commentary on this passage, Ps. lxxxix. 20–28). The eternal covenant of God

Digitized by Google

with David and his seed now entered as a new element into the history of revelation (comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 5); the full manifestation of the kingdom of God being henceforth combined with the realization of the "sure mercies of David," Isa. lv. 3, comp. with Ps. lxxxix. 50; and thus upon the foundation of the theocratic notion of kingship arose the prophecy of its antitypical perfection in Messiah (9).

It is not, however, solely in virtue of his theocratic position, but also by reason of his personal religious development, that David is an important character in the history of the Old Testament. That opposition between sin and grace, which it is the object of the pædagogy of the law to bring to light, attacked his inner life in its full severity; and that life evidences, as its external course advances in a state of continual conflict, both the deep degradation of the fallen, sin-burdened man, and the elevation of a spirit richly endowed with Divine grace. David experienced in a greater degree than any other Old Testament character, the restlessness and desolation of a soul burdened with the consciousness of guilt, the desire for reconciliation with God, the struggle after purity and renovation of heart, the joy of forgiveness, the heroic, the all-conquering power of confidence in God, the ardent love of a gracious heart for God; and has given in his *Psalms* imperishable testimony as to what is the fruit of the law and what the fruit of the spirit in man. And in saying this, we have touched upon that particular in which David most powerfully affected the spiritual life of his people. It was in him, the sweet singer of Israel, as he is called 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, that *sacred lyric poetry* attained its climax in Israel. Sacred song, which, to judge by existing specimens, had before him manifested more an objectively epic than a subjectively lyric character, had indeed been cultivated in Israel from the earliest times (as was shown § 105, note 10, and § 113); but it was not till after it had been elevated by David into an essential element of worship (on which see the next §), and the people had received from him

Digitized by Google

and other poets of his times a copious supply of sacred songs, that they could duly learn how to bring before God in music and song the joy and grief, the hope and fear, the prayer and praise that moved their inmost heart. It is impossible to rate too highly the treasure that Israel possessed in the Psalms, that copy-book of the saints, as Luther called them; nor can it be doubted that it was chiefly by means of the Psalms that the word of God dwelt in the homes of Israel, and that the knowledge of the sacred history was kept up among the people.

(1) In 2 Sam. v. 2 the people express—in perfect accordance with Deut. xvii. 15—their acknowledgment of the Divine call of David: "The Lord said unto thee, Thou shalt feed my people Israel, and thou shalt be ruler over Israel;" and David hereupon concludes a covenant before the Lord, with the people as represented by their elders. The expression בְּרִית . . . וַיִּכְרֹת לָהֶם, ver. 3, involving the notion that the two contracting parties had not equal rights (comp. § 80 above), should be observed.

(2) Hence all the attributes of the latter are ascribed to him: he is destined to subdue the heathen (Ps. xviii. 44, 48); his dominion is to extend to the end of the earth (ii. 8, comp. lxxii. 8, etc.), and is of continual and eternal duration (2 Sam. vii. 16, xxiii. 5), etc. (Art. *Kings of Israel.*)

(3) See on this narrative § 200, and Ewald in the 10th *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissenschaft*, p. 34 sqq.

(4) When Gad is called David's seer, 2 Sam. xxiv. 11, 1 Chron. xxi. 9, there is no reference to any special official position at court, in the sense in which court prophets have been spoken of, as a kind of king's privy councillors. The independence of the prophetic office is witnessed by the circumstance that there is no mention of prophets in those passages in which the officials of David and Solomon are enumerated (2 Sam. viii. 16, xx. 23; 1 Chron. xxvii. 32 sqq.; 1 Kings iv. 2 sqq.), though even the high priests appear in these lists of royal functionaries (art. *Prophetenthum des A. T.*).

(5) Hence all his successors are, in the history of the kings

Digitized by Google

of Israel, judged according to their conformity to David's example; the highest that can be said of them is, that they walked in the ways of David.

(6) On the importance of the situation of Jerusalem, see Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xvi. p. 297: "Jerusalem, built in the middle of Judea, out of the great roads of communication with the East, protected and cut off from the rest of the world,—on the east by the wilderness of the Dead Sea, on the north and west by the most difficult mountain-passes of Syria and the Mediterranean Sea, on the south by the deserts of Edom, extending far beyond Hebron and the plains of undulating sands spread out before Egypt,—itself standing on high rocky ground, without rich plains, almost without arable fields, without a river, nay, almost without natural springs or depth of soil,—this Jerusalem has nevertheless acquired an importance among capitals with which only that of Rome and Constantinople in the West can be compared." Ps. cxxv. 1: "They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth for ever. As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about His people from henceforth, even for ever."

(7) Comp. § 82. 1. The theocratic king is the son of God, the first-born among the kings of the earth (2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. xxix. 27 sq., comp. ii. 7). By sonship to God is expressed chiefly the relation of love and faithfulness in which God stands to the ruler of His people. The significance of sonship must not, however, as Hengstenberg, speaking of Ps. ii. 7, thinks, be limited to this; but the term further implies that the theocratic king is in this capacity begotten of God (comp. Ps. ii. 7), that his dignity is of Divine origin, his sovereignty a reflection of the Divine glory (comp. Ps. xxi. 4, 6). In like manner are the judges of the people also called gods and sons of the Highest, because their office originates in the judicial authority of God.

(8) Comp. also 1 Chron. xxix. 10; 1 Kings viii. 14, 55. This was done, however, without trenching upon the special offices of the priesthood. For the assistance of the priests was not excluded from the sacrifices of kings, 2 Sam. vi. 17; 1 Kings iii. 4; 2 Chron. i. 6; 1 Kings viii. 62 sqq., ix. 25; nor is it anywhere said that David and Solomon performed with

Digitized by Google

their own hands the sacrificial functions allotted by the law to the priests.

(9) For more on this subject, see Development of the Messianic Idea, in the didactic section.

§ 166.

Form of Worship under David (1).

That building of the temple which David was not suffered to accomplish, was at all events prepared for by this monarch. For it is evident from 2 Sam. viii. 11 that he accumulated considerable *treasures for the sanctuary*, by dedicating to the Lord all the gold, silver, and other booty which he took in his wars. The numerical statements of 1 Chron. xxii. are evidently excessive; but Ewald is certainly in the right when he remarks, that unless Solomon on entering upon the government had found considerable treasures, he could not so quickly have commenced the work of building. David, moreover, manifested *an active zeal for public worship*, which manifested itself, in the first place, with respect to the organization of the priesthood. The narrative of 1 Sam. xxii. 10, according to which Saul caused eighty-five priests to be put to death in one day at Nob, shows that the staff of priests must have considerably increased during the period of the judges. Zadok of the line of Eleazar, and Abiathar of the line of Ithamar, great-grandson of Eli according to Jewish tradition, appear contemporaneously as high priests during the time of David (2 Sam. xx. 25) (2). Zadok being, according to 1 Chron. xvi. 39, stationed at the tabernacle at Gibeon, Abiathar must have officiated in the sacred tent in which was the ark of the covenant at Jerusalem (3). David now regularly organized (4) *the priestly services*, by dividing the priests into twenty-four classes (מַחְלְקוֹת), of which sixteen belonged to the line of Eleazar and eight to that of Ithamar, 1 Chron. xxiv. 3, comp. with 2 Chron. viii. 14, xxxv. 4 sqq. Each

Digitized by Google

class had a president at its head; these were the שָׂרֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים, xxxvi. 14, Ezra x. 5, or רָאשֵׁי הַכֹּהֲנִים (LXX. *ἄρχοντες τῶν ἱερέων*), Neh. xii. 7, called also שָׂרֵי לֹדֶשׁ, 1 Chron. xxiv. 5 (comp. Isa. xliii. 28) (5). Each class had to officiate for a week, viz. from Sabbath to Sabbath, 2 Chron. xxiii. 4 (6). The order of the classes was determined by lot; see 1 Chron. xxiv. (7). David also organized the service of the Levites. Opportunity for using this was chiefly afforded him by the introduction of music into public worship, in which, according to the supplementary notice 2 Chron. xxix. 25, he is said to have followed the Divine directions delivered to him by the prophets Gad and Nathan. This service of song thus doing justice to words as well as acts in public worship, the spirituality of the temple service was increased,—the matter of some of the psalms being, moreover, directed against a dead externalism in Divine worship. This is manifest even on the first occasion on which David had to give orders with respect to music in public worship, viz. *at the bringing up of the ark to Mount Zion* (1 Chron. xiii. 2, ch. xv. sq., comp. with vi. 16 sqq.), when David, as we are told 1 Chron. xv. 16, commanded the chiefs of the Levites "to appoint their brethren the singers, with stringed instruments, harps, and lutes, and cymbals, to sing aloud and lift up the voice with joy." For Ps. xxiv. was undoubtedly composed upon this festive occasion; and its teaching is, that the God who now so graciously condescends to make His entrance into Zion with the ark of the covenant, is the Creator and Lord of the earth, the ruler of the hosts of heaven, and that he only may venture to approach Him in His holy place, who has clean hands and a pure heart, who has not lifted up his soul to vanity, nor sworn deceitfully. Nor less do we recognise in others of the most ancient psalms respecting the sanctuary on Zion (*e.g.* Ps. xv. and the magnificent song of Asaph, Ps. l.) the echo of the prophetic words, 1 Sam. xv. 22 (see above, § 164 and note 3) (8). According to 1 Chron. xvi. 37 sqq., Asaph and his kinsmen were appointed singers, and the

Digitized by Google

Jeduthunites, Obed-edom and Hosah and their kinsmen, door-keepers before the ark at Jerusalem; and Heman and Jeduthun singers, and the sons of Jeduthun doorkeepers, at the tabernacle at Gibeon. Towards the close of his life, David, with a view to the needs of the future temple, arranged a more complete organization of Levitical services (1 Chron. xxiii. sq.), dividing (ver. 3) the 38,000 Levites who were at that time thirty years old and upwards (9) into *four classes*, three of whom had charge of the service of the sanctuary, viz. 1*st*, the servants of the priests (24,000); 2*d*, singers and musicians (4000); 3*d*, doorkeepers (4000); to the fourth class, called officers and judges, was delivered the care of external affairs (הַמְּלָאכָה הַחִיצֹנָה, xxvi. 29) (10). The first class (11) was subdivided into twenty-four courses corresponding with the twenty-four classes of priests, the descendants of Gershon constituting six, those of Kohath nine, and those of Merari nine courses (12); the class of singers and minstrels (xxv. 9 sqq.) into twenty-four bands, each of which had a president and eleven masters of the same family at its head (13). The service of the doorkeepers was organized in military fashion, the notion of the Lord's encampment in the wilderness being transferred to the sanctuary, ix. 19; 2 Chron. xxxi. 2 (14). It is self-evident that the arrangements instituted by David could not be fully carried out till the completion of the temple by Solomon, as is indeed expressly stated 2 Chron. viii. 14 sq. (15). The class of servants to the priests was assisted in the lower kinds of service by the so-called Nethinim. The temple servants (*ἱερόδουλοι*, Joseph. *Antiq.* xi. 5. 1 sq.), who were probably, comp. Aben Ezra on Ezra ii. 43, originally the descendants of the Gibeonites, whom Joshua, according to Josh. ix. 27, made hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation and for the altar for all times (16), are thus called in the post-Babylonian books (1 Chron. ix. 2; Ezra vii. 24, etc.). To this race, however, which must have been considerably diminished by the bloody persecution raised against it for some unknown cause

Digitized by Google

by Saul (2 Sam. xxi. 1), were added, in consideration of the necessities of the increased service, servants presented by David and the princes for the use of the sanctuary (Ezra viii. 20), *i.e.* probably slaves, acquired as military booty, and also, according to ii. 58, Neh. vii. 60, xi. 3, sons of the servants of Solomon, *i.e.* descendants of the Canaanite vassals already mentioned, § 111. The name נְתִינִים (*i.e. traditi*, comp. נְתָנִים, Num. viii. 19) finds its explanation, Ezra viii. 20, אֲשֶׁר נָתַן דָּוִיד וְהַשָּׂרִים לַעֲבֹדַת הַלְוִיִּם (whom David and his princes *gave* for the service of the Levites) (17).

(1) The present section must be viewed as a continuation of what was said in vol. i. (§ 73.sq.) on the Priesthood and Leviteship (comp. also § 158).

(2) Comp. § 158. According to 2 Sam. viii. 17, 1 Chron. xviii. 16, xxiv. 3, 6, Zadok appears on an equality with Ahimelech the son of Abiathar. Bertheau's view of 1 Chron. xviii. 16, which makes Abiathar have a son, Ahimelech, who performed the priestly functions in conjunction with his father, obviates the gross confusion arising from the ordinary view.

(3) It is indeed possible that in pre-Davidic times, and during the disintegration of the theocracy, priests of both lines may have jointly performed high-priestly functions. The statement of Josephus (*Ant.* viii. 1. 3), that the priests of the line of Phinehas (*i.e.* Eleazar) lived in a private condition, while the line of Ithamar was in possession of the high-priestly dignity, must be regarded as a mere conjecture.

(4) Absolutely nothing is known as to the manner in which the two lines of Eleazar and Ithamar shared among themselves the priestly functions during the first centuries of the post-Mosaic history. For a statement of Jewish tradition on this point, see the article *Priesterthum im A. T.* in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* xii. p. 182.

(5) The זִקְנֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים (Isa. xxxvii. 2; 2 Kings xix. 2), on the contrary, are those priests whose age entitled them to respect, while the שָׂרִים of Jer. xxxv. 4, explained by Movers (*krit. Unters. über die Chronik*, p. 284) as also denoting the chiefs of the priestly classes, are generally no priests at all.

(6) 2 Kings xi. 9, in whatever manner the relation of this

Digitized by Google

passage to the narrative in Chronicles may be viewed, also points to an exchange of temple duty from Sabbath to Sabbath.

(7) The turns of the respective races of Eleazar and Ithamar were probably so arranged (see Bertheau on 1 Chron. xxiv. 6) that one house of Ithamar followed after every two houses of Eleazar. Hence, since the line of Eleazar was begun with, Jehoiarib and Jedaiah would be of this line, and Harim of that of Ithamar, etc. In opposition to the view of Herzfeld (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel vor der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels*, i. p. 381 sqq.), who regards the reference of this organization of the priestship to David as an invention of the Chronicler, we would only here mention that we have, in Ezek. viii. 16-18, an evident trace of this division of the priests in pre-Babylonian times; for those twenty-five men worshipping the sun, who from their location could be none but priests, must, as expositors after the precedent of Lightfoot correctly suppose, be the High priest and the heads of the twenty-four priestly orders. How this institution was subsequently developed, see the article quoted, p. 185 sq.

(8) The Levites whom David summoned to bear and accompany the ark, were divided into six houses under as many heads, four of which were of the race of Kohath, one of that of Gershon, and one of that of Merari (1 Chron. xv. 5). Besides musicians, there were also Levitical doorkeepers, שֹׁעֲרִים (ver. 23 sq.), of whom certain were also musicians (ver. 18).

(9) While the above passages presuppose thirty years of age as the period at which official duties were to begin, 1 Chron. xxiii. 25 sqq. tells us that the enactment that the functions of the Levites were to begin at their twentieth year—an enactment made in consideration of the circumstance that, since the transference of the sanctuary to Jerusalem, the bearing of the tabernacle and its vessels had ceased, and the service had thus been lightened—is to be attributed to David. On the relation of this passage to those cited above, see Bertheau *in loc.* The twentieth year was henceforth adopted as the *terminus a quo;* comp. 2 Chron. xxi. 17, Ezra iii. 8.

(10) The functions assigned to those classes at least who served at the sanctuary, seem for the most part to have been hereditary in the same families.

(11) These also seem to have merely borne the name לֵוִיִּם,

Digitized by Google

comp. Neh. xiii. 5, xii. 47; yet see, on the other hand, 1 Chron. ix. 14, where the musicians are called simply Levites. They assisted the priests in the offices enumerated in the 23d, 28th sq., and 31st sq. verses. See particulars in the article quoted in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* viii. p. 355.

(12) The guardians of the treasures of the sanctuary, enumerated 1 Chron. xxvi. 20–28, were probably chosen from this class.

(13) Of the choir leaders, four were sons of Asaph, of the house of Gershon (comp. 1 Chron. vi. 14–28); six sons of Jeduthun, who is correctly identified with Ethan, and therefore of the house of Merari (ver. 29); and fourteen sons of Heman of the Korahites, and therefore of the house of Kohath (vi. 18). The times of service of these choirs were probably interchanged in the same manner as those of the classes of priests. The share of the congregation in the musical service of the sanctuary seems to have been generally limited to saying Amen and praising the Lord (comp. xvi. 36), which latter refers to such doxological formulæ as "Hallelujah," "O give thanks unto the Lord, for He is gracious," etc., and the like (comp. Jer. xxxiii. 11). On the other hand, psalms were sung by the people themselves in festal processions (comp. Ps. lxviii. 26 sq.), and on the occasion of their pilgrimages to the sanctuary; for which latter purpose fifteen of the Psalms (Ps. cxx.–cxxxiv.), according to the most probable explanation of their titles, combine to form a special group. Some of these psalms are certainly of later origin, but the great antiquity of the custom is confirmed by Isa. xxx. 29. The last-named passage shows that such songs were especially connected with the celebration of the Passover (compare § 153 on the later ritual).

(14) The appointments with respect to these classes, 1 Chron. xvi. 1–19, presuppose throughout the existence of the temple (see Stähelin, *Versuch einer Geschichte der Verhältnisse des Stammes Levi*, in the *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1855, p. 720), but the families in question had been already employed in these services. For three families of doorkeepers are mentioned,—one a Korahite, and therefore of Kohath, at the head of which were Meshelemiah or Shelemiah, and Zachariah his first-born, for the eastern and northern sides, Obed-edom for the southern, and Hosah for the western side. Obed-edom

Digitized by Google

and Hosah have already been mentioned above. Of Shelemiah, moreover, who is called Shallum, ix. 19, and his son Zachariah, we are told, ix. 22, that Samuel and David appointed this family as doorkeepers to the tabernacle; nay, the remarkable information is appended, that their ancestors were guardians of the entrance under Moses and Joshua, and were in this capacity placed under the rule of Phinehas,—a statement concerning which nothing is found in the Pentateuch, but which is entirely in harmony with the Mosaic appointment, which committed to the race of Kohath the general care of the tabernacle. On the services of the families here mentioned, see Herzfeld, *id.* p. 390 sqq.; Bertheau *in loc.*; and the article *Levi, Leviten*, p. 355; the same on the three keepers of the threshold, mentioned 2 Kings xxv. 18, Jer. lii. 24, and p. 356 on the designation of priests as keepers of the threshold in 2 Kings xii. 10. The fourth class of Levites, the officers and judges, are but briefly spoken of, 1 Chron. xxvi. 29 sqq. They were of the race of Kohath, of the lines of Izhar and Hebron, and were, as we are told vers. 30 and 32, employed in the service of both the Lord and the king.

(15) That these arrangements, as above described, actually existed in the pre-Babylonian temple, and were in all essential points introduced by Solomon, cannot on adequate grounds be disputed (comp. Ewald, *Gesch. Israels*, i. sec. 3, p. 57, iii. sec. 3, p. 338). For where in succeeding centuries could a period be found to which the reorganization of the Levitical orders could be reasonably transferred?

(16) Josh. ix. 27 cannot be understood of the employment of the Nethinim in the service of individual Israelites, but only as stating that they served the congregation by the offices they performed for the sanctuary. Deut. xxix. 10 has induced some to transfer the origin of the Nethinim to the Mosaic period, though this passage does but speak in a general manner of the strangers in the Israelite camp, upon whom the lowest services were imposed.

(17) All these were undoubtedly bound to observe the Mosaic law, for the uncircumcised would in no case have been suffered in the sanctuary. At all events, this was certainly the case in post-Babylonian times, Neh. x. 29 sq. On the numbers, dwelling-places, and maintenance of the Nethinim after the

Digitized by Google

captivity, and on the question whether the intermarriage of Israelites and Nethinim was allowed, see the article in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* x. p. 296 sq.; on the latter point, see also Carpzov. app. p. 112.

III. SOLOMON.

§ 167.

The Building of the Temple

The first fulfilment of the promise given to David (comp. 1 Kings viii. 20) appeared in Solomon, the son of Bathsheba, who (according to 2 Sam. xii. 25) was educated by the prophet Nathan, and raised mainly by his influence to the throne, in opposition to the claims of his elder brother Adonijah. During a long period of peace, undisturbed till towards the close of his long reign, and living in the memory of the people as a type of the Divine peace of Messianic times (comp. with 1 Kings v. 5, iv. 25, the prophetic passages Mic. iv. 4, Zech. viii. 10 sqq.), he enjoyed the glory which the wars of his father had obtained for the kingdom.

Among Solomon's works, the temple (1) offers special matter for consideration with respect to biblical theology. It was seven years in building, and stood upon the plateau of Moriah (2), enlarged for the purpose by foundations to an extent of 80,000 square cubits. It was thus built on the very spot on which David, in conformity with the directions of the prophet Gad, had formerly reared an altar (2 Chron. iii. 1, comp. with 2 Sam. xxiv. 18). The *description of the temple* given 1 Kings vi. sq. is evidently derived from a document compiled by an eye-witness, though the text seems in some few instances to have been incorrectly transmitted. The account in 2 Chron. iii. sq. differs in some respects, and is not free from objections. The description of the new temple Ezek. xl.–xlii. must be

Digitized by Google

cautiously used in elucidation; for though the visionary delineation of the priestly prophet is founded upon the image of the old temple, yet the latter is idealized, and even altered in some particulars, to suit the predicted forms of worship. Josephus, too (*Antiq.* viii. 3), who frequently follows the leadings of his imagination, can only be appealed to with reservation. The proportions of the tabernacle were in all essential respects followed in the temple building, בֵּית יְהוָֹה, which was constructed of hewn stone. The dimensions were, however, doubled,—the temple being, according to 1 Kings vi. 2, sixty cubits long, twenty wide, and thirty high (3). It was divided into two parts, of which the foremost, called in the stricter sense הֵיכָל, was forty cubits long; the hindmost, the holy of holies, called דְּבִיר, twenty cubits long and as many high and broad, thus forming a cube (4). According to this statement, the temple would be externally ten cubits lower at the holy of holies than at the holy place, just as in Egyptian temples the *sanctuarium* is lower than the temple itself, and in Christian churches the choir lower than the nave. This is, however, generally doubted; and עֲלִיּוֹת, *i.e. upper chambers*, being mentioned 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, 2 Chron. iii. 9, it is supposed either that these were over the holy of holies, or (as by Kurtz and Merz) that the holy place also was only twenty cubits high, and that these upper chambers extended over the whole length of the building (5). The interior of the temple was overlaid with wood, upon which were representations in carved work of cherubim, palms, and flower cups. Before the east side of the temple was a porch, אוּלָם, the whole breadth of the house, and therefore twenty cubits long and ten wide. Its height is not stated in 1 Kings vi., but 2 Chron. iii. 4 declares it to have been 120 cubits, a height which cannot be justified by referring to the propylæ of Egyptian temples, and which, on such a foundation and before such an edifice, was impossible. There can be no doubt that we have here, as is frequently the case in Chronicles, a textual error; and a height of twenty (Movers reads עֶשְׂרִים), or more

Digitized by Google

correctly of thirty cubits, is now generally accepted. Before this porch, according to the ordinary view, but within it, according to 1 Kings vii. 19, stood two colossal columns of brass, called Jachin and Boaz (יָכִין, בֹּעַז), adorned with castings of lilies, network, and pomegranates, vii. 15–22, comp. with 2 Kings xxv. 16 sq., and having capitals in the form of full-blown lilies. Their height, which is differently stated in Chronicles, was, according to 1 Kings vii. 23, twenty-three (18 + 5) cubits. It has long been a matter of dispute whether these pillars stood independently (so Bähr), or supported as columns the roof of the porch (so LXX. 1 Kings vii. 15, and among moderns, Merz and others). The fact of their being reckoned among the vessels, and the house being complete without them, speaks against the latter view (6). The temple was surrounded on its three remaining sides by a secondary erection of three tiers of side chambers, צְלָעוֹת, designed for stores and treasures. The height of each storey being five cubits, and therefore, if allowance must, as is probable, be made for projections, the height of the whole amounting at most to eighteen cubits, there would be sufficient space for the lattice windows mentioned 1 Kings vi. 4, which, moreover, were intended not for the purpose of lighting the edifice—for this was effected by lamps—but for ventilation. The holy of holies in the temple as well as the tabernacle was quite dark (comp. viii. 12). The temple was next surrounded by two courts, raised one above the other like terraces (comp. 2 Kings xxi. 5), of which, however, the inner alone was perhaps completed by Solomon, only one court being mentioned 1 Kings vi. 36. This is called, 2 Chron. iv. 9, חֲצַר הַכֹּהֲנִים, and, Jer. xxxvi. 10, the upper court, from its elevated position. It was undoubtedly of a square form, like the court of the tabernacle, and of the temple in Ezekiel's vision (Ezek. xl. 47) (7). The second court, הָעֲזָרָה הַגְּדוֹלָה, the place of worship for the people, was probably separated from the first not by a wall but only by a railing, thus allowing the congregation to witness what was

Digitized by Google

transacted in the court of the priests. Thus the separation of the people from the holy place was more strictly effected in the temple than in the tabernacle. The furniture and vessels of the temple corresponded on the whole with those of the tabernacle, except that they were of increased dimensions, and that certain were found in the former which were absent from the latter. In the court of the priests, as in the court of the tabernacle, stood the altar of burnt-offering; in the place of the laver of purification was the so-called brazen sea, whose rim was in the form of a full-blown lily, and which was supported by twelve brazen oxen, three turned to each quarter of the heavens; on each side of the court were five brazen lavers, for the purification of all that pertained to the altar of burnt-offering; upon the brazen bases of these lavers were carvings in raised work of lions, oxen, palms, and cherubim. In the הֵיכָל as well as in the tabernacle were the altar of incense, the table of shew-bread (according to 2 Chron. iv. 8, *ten* tables of shew-bread); while instead of the one candlestick of the tabernacle there were ten golden candlesticks, five on each side, before the holy of holies. This was separated from the הֵיכָל by a thick wooden partition, in which were folding doors (1 Kings vi. 31). If a curtain was, according to 2 Chron. iii. 14, also added, it is uncertain whether this, as some suppose, covered the open doors, or as others, with Thenius, conjecture, hung over the doors. Besides this, entrance into the holy of holies was also prevented by chains of gold, for so must the difficult passage 1 Kings vi. 21 be explained, as by Ewald and others. In the Holy of Holies there were, besides the ark, two cherubim ten cubits high, whose four wings, each four cubits long, spread out horizontally, touched each other in the midst over the ark, and reached on the right and left to the two walls of the Holy of Holies.

(1) The literature concerning the temple of Solomon is very copious. Grüneisen's ample treatise, *Revision der jüngsten*

Digitized by Google

Forschungen über den salomonischen Tempel, in the *Kunstblatt* of the *Morgenblatt*. 1831, Nos. 73–80, formed a provisional close. Then followed monographs by Keil (*Der Tempel Salomo's*, 1839, comp. his *Archäologie*, i. p. 119 sqq.); Bähr (*Der Salomon. Tempel*, 1849); Thenius (*Das vorexilische Jerusalem und dessen Tempel*, an appendix to his Commentary on the Books of Kings, 1849); comp. also Ewald's *Geschichte Israels*, iii. Merz's *Tempel zu Jerusalem*, in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* xv. p. 500 sqq., forms another close, and contains a complete and critical review of the literature of this subject. I have entered so far only into the description as may be needful with respect to the symbolic significance of the sanctuary.

(2) Remains of Solomon's temple are still recognised in the gigantic blocks of masonry, often thirty or more feet long, found among the foundations on the temple site.

(3) Merz, *id.* p. 503: Reckoning the cubit at 1 foot 5 inches, this gives 90 feet of length and 30 of breadth, about the dimensions of a moderate-sized village church, which indeed does not agree with the words, 2 Chron. ii. 45, "and the house which I built is great, for great is our God above all gods." Heathen temples, however, were generally but small, being rather receptacles for the images of the gods than places of assembly for the people.

(4) דְּבִיר probably means the hinder space, not the place of speech, λαλητήριον, *oraculi sedes*, the word being lexically connected not with דָּבָר, but with the Kal דָּבַר, to be behind any one.

(5) Bähr, on the contrary, supposes a clerical error in 1 Kings vi. 2, and thinks that the whole building was but twenty cubits high.

(6) Merz appeals chiefly to Amos ix. 1. This passage would unquestionably favour the columnar character of the pillars; but it is not the temple at Jerusalem which is here spoken of.

(7) The notion that it was semicircular, rests upon the utterly unauthorized comparison of Solomon's temple with the temple of Urania at Paphos.

Digitized by Google

§ 168.

Significance and Dedication of the Temple.

The symbolical significance of the temple is entirely identical with that of the tabernacle. The Book of Chronicles (1 Chron. xxviii. 19), by referring to the inspiration of Jehovah the plan delivered to Solomon by David, perceives in this edifice *the impress of Jehovistic ideas.* It by no means follows from the circumstance that Phœnician artisans were employed on the building, that the temple of Solomon coincided with *Phœnician* temples. Besides, Hiram, the only Phœnician foreman mentioned, was only employed in the preparation of the pillars of the porch and the vessels, 1 Kings vii. 13 sqq., and he had but to carry out the instructions given him (2 Chron. ii. 13, אֲשֶׁר יְיַתֵּן־לוֹ) (1). The two pillars of the porch have in the first place been incorrectly regarded as a heathen symbol. The name יָכִין signifies "he who establishes;" and בֹּעַז, probably = בּוֹ עֹז, "in him is strength," is by others derived from the Arabic بغز, *alacritas* (2). The meaning of the pillars evidently is, that God has here established His temple on a firm foundation (comp. Ps. lxxxvii. 1), and that it is therefore to be no longer a travelling sanctuary like the tabernacle (comp. with respect to the contrast between the latter and the temple, 2 Sam. vii. 5–7). It is just because Jehovah no longer dwells in a moving tent, but in a settled house, that the cherubim *stand* in the temple upon the floor of the Holy of Holies, and make the whole place the constant abode of the Divine presence (as Hofmann justly remarks in his *Schriftbeweis*). It is quite a matter of indifference that the pillar is also a symbol of Saturn, as the sustainer of the system of nature (3). If Br. Bauer regards the pillars as symbols of the penetrating power of the solar beam, it must be remarked, on the other hand, that these pillars were not obelisks, whose needle-like form is emblematical of the rays

Digitized by Google

of the sun. Secondly, the *twelve oxen* who supported the brazen sea might be regarded as originally a symbol of nature, namely, as symbolic of the months, the supporters of the order of ever-fleeting time. It is not, however, easy to see what a vessel for purification could have to do with such a symbol. The number twelve being always in worship the mark of the covenant people, the twelve tribes approaching Jehovah with animal sacrifices, by means of the Levitical priesthood, may, as Keil and others think, be rather intended. Palms, lilies, and pomegranates (comp. also § 119) are chosen as decorations, as the most beautiful of the natural productions of Palestine,—the palm being even in later days the symbol of the country on Jewish coins. The reason for increasing the one candlestick and table of shew-bread of the tabernacle to the ten candlesticks and ten tables of Solomon's temple, is found in the greater extent of the latter, the number ten being also itself a completed unity. But the clearest proof that Solomon's temple was not, as some extravagantly assert, a temple of the Sun or of Saturn, is to be found in the fact that, when Manasseh subsequently changed it into a sanctuary for the host of heaven, the existing symbols of worship were not made use of, but others introduced (2 Kings xxi. 5, 7, xxiii. 11). The temple being completed, Solomon had the ark brought into it, and the tabernacle taken down and deposited, together with its sacred utensils, in the temple, probably in the side chambers, 1 Kings viii. 4, thus putting an end to the twofold worship. The king then himself *dedicated* the temple by prayer and sacrifice in the seventh month (Tisri), 1 Kings viii. Then followed a festival of fourteen days' duration (vers. 2 and 65, comp. 2 Chron. v. 3, vii. 9 sq.), which must be understood as applying to the feast of the dedication from the 8th to the 14th Tisri, and to the seven days of the Feast of Tabernacles from the 15th to the 21st, the people being dismissed, according to 1 Kings viii. 66, on the 22d, but according to 2 Chron. vii. 10, not till the 23d, *i.e.* not till after the Azereth on the eighth day, comp. § 156.—A permanent

Digitized by Google

sanctuary seemed to have been now erected; and Solomon expressed in his prayer the hope that this house might be a house of prayer for all nations (1 Kings viii. 41–43). He received, however, in a vision, an intimation from God, which, while it granted indeed the prayer that God would dwell in the temple, and renewed the promise given to David, threatened the destruction of the temple and the dispersion of Israel among all nations, in case they should go and serve other gods.

Concerning the temple worship, we further learn from ix. 25 that Solomon offered sacrifices three times a year, which must refer to the pilgrimage feasts. Solomon having at the commencement of his reign deposed Abiathar as an adherent of Adonijah, the high-priesthood again devolved to the line of Eleazar (ii. 27), to which Zadok belonged.

(1) Though Vatke makes the temple of Heracles at Tyre the model of Solomon's temple, we learn, on the other hand, from K. O. Müller, *Archäol. der Kunst*, sec. 3, p. 298, that nothing at all is known of the construction of this temple; and when the temple of the Syrian goddess at Hierapolis, described by Lucian, *de Dea Syra*, cap. 28 sqq., and of which no one knows whether its architecture was of specifically Phœnician character, is dragged into the discussion, every one can see that the similarity said to exist between the two temples is as vague and indefinite as that between a hundred others.

(2) It is the notion of Ewald (*Gesch. Israels*, i. sec. 3, p. 44, iii. sec. 3, p. 324), that Solomon may perhaps have thus designed to perpetuate the names of two favourites, or of two of his younger sons.

(3) When Movers (*Phönicier*), however, thinks that the pillar Boaz signified motion proceeding forth from eternal repose,—creative motion,—somewhat too much is attributed to it; a pillar is said to symbolize motion—*lucus a non lucendo.*

Digitized by Google

§ 169.

Hebrew Proverbial Poetry: The Khachamim.

As the sacred lyric poetry of Israel is connected with the name of David, so also is Solomon, whose peaceful times invited the Israelitish mind to self-introspection, the father of Hebrew proverbial poetry, 1 Kings v. 12 sq., iv. 28 sq., and thus the founder of the Old Testament Khochmah. From his time onwards there appeared a special class of men under the name of חֲכָמִים, "the wise" (Prov. i. 6, xxii. 17, xxiv. 23, etc.), who applied themselves to the consideration of the moral relations of life and the manner in which the world is ordered. It cannot, however, be inferred from 1 Kings iv. 33 that they were addicted to physical science, nor that Solomon commenced, as Ewald *e.g.* supposes, a complete natural history. For when it is there said that "Solomon spake of trees, from the cedar that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall; he spake also of beasts, and of fowls, and of creeping things, and of fishes," it is that ethical contemplation of nature of which we have specimens in Ps. civ. and in the Book of Job, especially ch. xxxix.–xli.,—that relative knowledge which enabled Solomon in his proverbs to draw comparisons and parables from natural objects, which is intended, and which does not presuppose a scientific knowledge of botany and zoology (as even Keil *in loc* thinks). The Khachamim (or the wise) were at any rate distinct from those theocratic officials, the prophets and priests (comp. Jer. xviii. 18, though it is questionable whether חָכָם is to be there taken in its narrower meaning; see, on the contrary, viii. 9 sq.). *The province of the Old Testament Khochmah* was different from that of the Law and of Prophecy,—it did not extend to theocratic enactments and directions (1). There is not, however, the slightest trace that the Khachamim (as Bruch especially represents the matter in his *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, 1831) set

Digitized by Google

themselves in opposition to theocratic enactments, particularly those relating to worship, and occupied the position philosophers do with respect to orthodox theologians. Such a notion is at variance with the circumstance that Solomon, who built the temple and gave completeness to the ritual of worship, stands at the head of these men; and that among those wise men mentioned 1 Kings iv. 31, besides himself, viz. Ethan, Heman, Chalcol, and Darda, the two first named were probably the well-known Levitical chief singers (1 Chron. xv. 17) (2). A circle of sages, among whom the king was distinguished for the fertility and many-sidedness of his genius, and for his acuteness in solving enigmatical questions (comp. besides 1 Kings iii. 13 sq., x. 1), was probably formed at Solomon's court. An association of Khachamim, employing themselves in the collection of literature, must, according to Prov. xxv. 1, have also existed under Hezekiah (3). This does not, however, prove that these sages had any official vocation in the nation, and founded institutions like the schools of the prophets; nor that, as Ewald expresses it, they were constantly forming more perfect schools (4). Disciples, eager for knowledge, may certainly have united themselves to individuals in special repute for wisdom (comp. such passages as xiii. 20, xv. 12, etc., in connection with the already quoted i. 6, etc.); but the Wisdom which speaks in the Proverbs does not desire to be the mere wisdom of the schools, but "crieth without and uttereth her voice in the streets," i. 20. The places in which the wise dispensed counsel, administered reproof, exhortation, or instruction, as circumstances required, discussed the problems which were agitating the minds of men (comp. *e.g.* Ezek. xviii. 2 sq.), excited and delighted their hearers by witty sarcasm, etc., were the public places where justice was administered and the affairs of the congregation debated,—where even prophets, as occasion demanded, also delivered their testimony to the people. The description given by Job of himself, ch. xxix. 7–11 and 21–25, may be mentioned in illustration (5).

Digitized by Google

(1) Their drift, as Delitzsch states it in his excellent article *Sprüche Salomo's* in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* xiv. p. 715, is chiefly the human in the Israelite, the generally religious in Jehovism, and the moral in the Law.

(2) Hengstenberg, Keil, von Thenius, and Delitzsch dispute, but upon insufficient grounds, the identity of the names.

(3) It cannot be determined whether these "men of Hezekiah" constituted a special commission whose object was the restoration of the ancient national literature (appendix to Drechsler's *Der Prophet Jesaja*, ii. 2, p. 221), or formed a voluntary association.

(4) In the treatise *über die Volks- und Geistesfreiheit Israels, bibl. Jahrb.* i. p. 97, which offers many other just observations.

(5) It was thus that Wisdom became that intellectual power in the nation, so well described by Ewald in the treatise quoted (art. *Pädagogik des A. T.*). For further particulars, see the third part of the Old Testament theology.

§ 170.

Solomon's External Organizations. The Dark Sides of his Reign. Division of the Kingdom.

Solomon employed the long interval of peace in still further carrying out the organization of the state, in rearing various edifices and fortifications, especially in Jerusalem itself (1 Kings ix. 15 sqq., xi. 27), and in the promotion of industry and commerce, which latter extended from the Edomite ports of Elath and Ezion-geber, now belonging to Israel, as far as to Ophir, *i.e.* probably the Indian Isles (1 Kings ix. 26 sqq., x. 11, 22) (1). This "magnificent reign" (Hasse) had, however, its dark side. The king's love of splendour became more and more oppressive to the people, and he sank deeper and deeper into effeminacy and luxury, till he at last allowed himself to be seduced by his heathen wives into an open breach with theocratic institutions,

Digitized by Google

by erecting for their sakes (xi. 4 sqq.) sanctuaries for strange gods in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem, ver. 7, comp. with 2 Kings xxiii. 13. His intention apparently was to obtain for Israel a higher position among the nations of the world, by attempting *to break through the exclusiveness of the people* in a political point of view, by opening the country to the commerce of the Phœnicians, in a religious one, by striving after general religious freedom. Nor were the people themselves free from religious and moral libertinism, for from this time forward we meet with a class of men forming a contrast to the Khachamim,—lascivious free-thinkers, called לֵצִים, *scorners*, in the Book of Proverbs. Their definition is thus given, Prov. xxi. 24, where a proud and insolent one who acts with excess of audacity is called לֵץ (2). The prophetic order, however, which had, it seems, long remained in the background, now arose against the king, to avenge the insulted majesty of the law. After a warning (1 Kings xi. 11–13) had been given to Solomon,—perhaps by Ahijah the Ephraimite,—Jeroboam, a highly-placed official of Solomon, received an intimation from the prophet Ahijah that ten tribes of Israel were to be severed from the house of David and to be united in a separate kingdom under the sceptre of Jeroboam, ver. 29 sqq. (3). The procedure of Ahijah on this occasion corresponds with that adopted by Samuel towards Saul, and is equally incapable of being explained from self-seeking motives, as is attempted *e.g.* by Ewald (*Geschichte Israels*, ed. 1, iii. sec. 1, p. 463, ed. 3, p. 824), who thinks that the prophetic order was again seeking to exercise supremacy over the kingship, because it failed to perceive that the period of prophetic power was past (as though the political agency of the prophets would not be now for the first time rightly exercised!). It cannot even be correctly asserted that Ahijah incited Jeroboam to rebellion. With respect to Solomon, Ahijah expressly declared, ver. 34, that the Lord would let him be ruler of Israel all the days of his life; and Jeroboam might learn how he was to behave from David,

Digitized by Google

who, humanly speaking, had far more reason for rebelling against Saul, but who waited for that Divine leading the end of which was assured to him without arbitrary interference on his part (see Keil *in loc.*). Jeroboam, however, seems, even during the life of Solomon, to have stirred up the people against their king. He was obliged to flee to Egypt; but being recalled immediately after the death of Solomon, he placed himself, at the popular assembly convened at Shechem, at the head of those who spoke with Rehoboam on the part of the people. When their reasonable demands were perversely rejected by Rehoboam, ten tribes renounced their allegiance, and made Jeroboam their king. In vain did Rehoboam raise a considerable force from that part of the nation which remained faithful to him; a word from the prophet Shemaiah sufficed to disband his whole army (xii. 22 sqq.; 2 Chron. xi. 2 sqq.) (4). The ancient jealousy of the two powerful tribes of Ephraim and Judah, and the opposition of Judah to the rest of Israel, which had already resulted in a temporary division of the kingdom after Saul's death (§ 165), and again in the latter days of David, on the occasion related 2 Sam. xix. 41–44, xx. 1 sq., now resulted in the permanent *separation of Israel into two kingdoms.* The question *how the ten tribes which composed the northern kingdom are to be computed,* is so difficult to answer, that many have endeavoured, with Keil, to regard the number ten as merely symbolical; which view the expression "we have ten parts in the king," 2 Sam. xix. 44, may perhaps be considered to corroborate. The tribe of Levi not being reckoned (as already remarked, § 92) in the political division of the nation, and Benjamin belonging, according to 1 Kings xii. 21, 2 Chron. xi. 3, x. 23, xiv. 7, to the kingdom of Judah, it would seem that the number ten must refer to the remaining tribes, Manasseh and Ephraim making two. But the tribe of Simeon cannot possibly be set down to the northern kingdom, although 2 Chron. xv. 9 (xxxiv. 6) assumes that Simeonites belonged to it. The lot of this tribe lay, according to Josh. xix. 1–9, within the

Digitized by Google

realm of Judah, in the south-west, towards Philistia and Idumea. It seems not to have formed a compact province, but to have consisted of several single towns and districts. The Simeonite town Beer-sheba is, in 1 Kings xix. 3, expressly said to have belonged to Judah. On the other hand, Bethel, Gilgal, and Jericho, chief places in the tribe of *Benjamin*, appear as towns of the northern kingdom; and the Benjamite town of Ramah, only nine miles north of Jerusalem, belonged, at least under Baasha, to the same, according to xv. 17, 21. The tribe of Benjamin, too, in virtue of ancient kinship, had always adhered to the house of Joseph, and during the march through the wilderness had been combined into a triad with Ephraim and Manasseh, Num. ii. 17 sqq., x. 21–24 (comp. § 29 and note 5). In the former disruption of the kingdom, it had, as the tribe to which Saul belonged, been on the side of the tribes that separated from David; nay, even subsequently, we find, from 2 Sam. xx. 1, a rebellion arising in Benjamin at the instigation of Sheba. So too, in Ps. lxxx., which refers to the carrying into captivity of the northern kingdom, we find Benjamin placed, ver. 3, between Ephraim and Manasseh. The actual state of things was that the tribe of *Benjamin was shared by the two kingdoms*, the greater part of the country belonging to the northern kingdom, while the certainly more populous part, in which the northern part of Jerusalem and its neighbourhood were situated, was united to the kingdom of Judah. Thus it was true both that the house of David, strictly speaking, possessed but one (entire) tribe, as it is expressed 1 Kings xi. 13, 32, 36, and that numerous members of the tribe of Benjamin belonged to Judah (5). That portion, too, of the tribe of Dan which dwelt in their original lot, Josh. xix. 40 sqq., between Benjamin, Judah, and Ephraim, belonged to Judah. A few Danite cities are mentioned, 2 Chron. xi. 10, xxviii. 18, as pertaining to the kingdom of Judah; but since this tribe dwelt partly in the north, it may nevertheless be computed among the ten. Thus Rehoboam's army may correctly be spoken of, 1 Kings xii. 23, as

Digitized by Google

"all the house of Judah and Benjamin, and the rest of the people." Among the children of Israel who dwelt in the cities of Judah, mentioned ver. 17 as Rehoboam's subjects, were probably included members of other tribes also. And when to these are added the numerous emigrations from the northern kingdom into that of Judah in succeeding centuries (comp. 2 Chron. xv. 9), it may well be said that among the *Jews* (יְהוּדִים), which name now arose in the southern kingdom, *all Israel* was represented. The disruption of Israel was from this time irremediable; in a short time, not reckoning the reigns of Ahab and Jehoshaphat and their immediate successors, the separated kingdoms took up hostile positions with respect to each other (6), and at last mutually consumed their strength in sanguinary wars. The external glory of the kingdom was at an end; but prophecy never ceased to direct the expectation of the nation to the future reunion of the twelve tribes under one head of the house of David (7).

(1) Ritter, in his *Erdkunde*, xiv. pp. 348–431, gives a detailed investigation of Solomon's trade to Ophir.

(2) See on this subject Ewald, *id.* p. 100; Delitzsch, *id* p. 713.

(3) The lasting stability of his house, *i.e.* of his family, was also promised to Jeroboam if he should continue faithful to the Divine law. This promise was accompanied, however, by a declaration, 1 Kings xi. 30, that the humiliation of David's house was but temporary. It was thus shown that the promise of perpetual kingship was to be realized in the dynasty not of Jeroboam but of David (see Keil *in loc.*).

(4) This circumstance shows in what respect the prophetic office was still held by the people, although its public agency had for a long period been intermitted.

(5) Comp. Hengstenberg in his commentary on Ps. lxxx. Hupfeld's interpretation of the last quoted passage is very unnatural, when, treating of Ps. lxxx., he seeks to understand by the *one* tribe Benjamin, which David's house was to retain *besides* Judah. There is no authority for making up the number of the ten tribes (as Delitzsch does in his *Commentary on the*

Digitized by Google

Psalms, i. sec. 1, p. 611) by counting the tribe of Manasseh as two.

(6) That the two kingdoms subsequently, perhaps under Uzziah, were upon more friendly terms, and even concluded a "league of brotherhood," is a notion invented in explanation of Zech. ix. 13, xi. 14 (see *e.g.* Bleek in the *theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1852, pp. 268 and 292), and without foundation in the historical narratives.

(7) This subject will be more particularly treated hereafter. The restoration, however, of the tribes as such being predicted, their continuance is evidently presupposed. This is also actually guaranteed even to the centuries next following; comp. with respect to the tribes of the northern kingdom, 1 Chron. v. 26; Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 5. 2.

THIRD DIVISION.

THE KINGDOM OF THE TEN TRIBES.

§ 171.

Preliminary Remarks.

The history of the northern kingdom, called, as the basis of the nation, the kingdom of Israel, or, after its chief tribe, that of Ephraim, comes chiefly under the consideration of biblical theology, as exhibiting, in the conflict waged against the apostate realm by the prophetic order, the powerful agency of the latter, and as manifesting, in the whole course of the events which befell it, the serious nature of Divine retribution. Nine dynasties, including nineteen kings (not reckoning Tibni, 1 Kings xvi. 22), succeeded each other in the two centuries and a half during which the kingdom existed (from 975 to 720 B.C.), and only two, those of Omri and Jehu, possessed the throne for any length of time. The history is full of conspiracies, regi-

Digitized by Google

cides, and civil wars; it is a continuous testimony to the fact that, when once the divinely appointed path is forsaken, sin is ever producing fresh sin, and that the punishment of one crime is inflicted by another.

The history may be fitly divided into two distinct periods. The extirpation of Omri's dynasty by Jehu, after his elevation to the throne by Elisha, forms the chief turning-point. Under Jehu's dynasty, the kingdom, which was hastening to its destruction, took a fresh flight, but only to succumb the more speedily to its final doom.

FIRST PERIOD.

FROM JEROBOAM I. TO THE OVERTHROW OF THE DYNASTY OF OMRI (ACCORDING TO THE USUAL CHRONOLOGY, 975–884 B.C.).

§ 172.

Jeroboam I. to Omri.

Jeroboam at first took up his abode at Shechem, the chief town of Ephraim (1). Subsequently, however, he dwelt at Tirzah, xiv. 17, which continued to be the capital under his immediate successors, xv. 21 (2). The first measure taken by Jeroboam was to make the political separation of the tribes a religious schism, by completing the breach with the theocratic institutions, the connection of his people with the worship at Jerusalem seeming to him politically dangerous. In his innovations, however, Jeroboam followed tradition. He erected two separate sanctuaries, one in the south at Bethel, a place consecrated by ancient memories. This was the "king's chapel," as it is called Amos vii. 13, a designation on which is very characteristically impressed the fact, that in the kingdom of the ten tribes the politico-ecclesiastical had taken the place of the theocratic principle. The other sanctuary was erected in the

Digitized by Google

north at Dan, where image-worship had already existed in the time of the Judges (Judg. xviii.). In causing Jehovah to be worshipped at these places under the symbol of a calf, Jeroboam was also returning to the image-worship instituted by Aaron in the wilderness, as is shown by the words of 1 Kings xii. 28, which are borrowed from Ex. xxxii. 4. Since, however, the Holy One of Israel was thus degraded to a power of nature, this image-worship was nothing else than idolatry, and was treated as such by the prophets. A similar worship must subsequently have existed in Gilgal, which is named along with Bethel, Amos iv. 4 (comp. also v. 5; Hos. iv. 15, ix. 15, xii. 12) (3). One main obstacle to the new worship was formed by the Levites dwelling among the ten tribes. Jeroboam therefore, as we learn from 2 Chron. xi. 13 sqq. (comp. xiii. 9), drove from his realm the *Levites and priests;* and these, together with other subjects of the northern kingdom who refused to take part in this apostasy from the legitimate worship, departed in great numbers to the kingdom of Judah. On this account, Jeroboam, according to 1 Kings xii. 31 and xiii. 33, "made priests out of the whole people (of the lowest of the people, A. V.) who were not of the sons of Levi; whosoever would, he consecrated him," etc., comp. 2 Chron. xiii. 9 (4). The moral disorder to which this priesthood of the northern kingdom fell a prey is shown Hos. iv. 6 sqq., vi. 9. Of the religious ceremonies introduced by Jeroboam, we are only told, 1 Kings xii. 32, that he instituted a feast corresponding to the Feast of Tabernacles, transferring it from the 15th of the seventh, to the 15th of the eighth month, perhaps with regard to the later harvest of the northern districts. It is, however, evident, from several allusions in the prophets Amos and Hosea, that many Mosaic forms of worship were practised in the sanctuaries of the northern kingdom. For though the date of these prophets is more than a century later, it is certain that such forms of Jehovistic worship as existed in their days in the kingdom of the ten tribes could not have been introduced subsequently to

Digitized by Google

Jeroboam, but must have been handed down from ancient times in this kingdom. From Hos. ii. 13, compared with ix. 5 (v. 7), Amos v. 21, viii. 5, 10, we see that the celebration of the Sabbaths, new moons, and festivals still continued; from iv. 5, v. 22, that the different kinds of Mosaic sacrifices were in use; from Hos. iv. 7 sqq., that the priests partook of the sin-offerings; while Amos iv. 4 contains an allusion to the tenth of the third year (5).

Jeroboam had, as has been said, got rid of the priests and Levites; but the opposition of the prophets, those watchmen of the theocracy, was only the more powerful. Individual prophets, indeed, when they found that Jehovism continued to be the state religion, and that the newly introduced image-worship maintained several of the ancient legal forms, may have been satisfied, or, like the old prophet of whom we read 1 Kings xiii. 11 sqq. (6), have been silent from fear. But after the arrival of the prophet from Judah, who, according to ch. xiii., prophesied against the worship at Bethel, and warned Jeroboam in vain, Ahijah, the same prophet who had foretold his elevation, and who still dwelt at Shiloh, pronounced the curse of God against him, on account of this very image-worship, and predicted the approaching extirpation of his house, 1 Kings xiv. 7 sqq. Nadab the son of Jeroboam was slain, after a reign of two years, by Baasha; but as, according to the now usual expression, he walked in the ways of Jeroboam, his son Elah, in conformity with the curse pronounced against his house by the prophet Jehu, xvi. 1 sqq., fell a victim to a conspiracy set on foot by Zimri; and this was, as we are expressly told ver. 7, designed also as a punishment for the slaughter of the house of Jeroboam by Baasha. For it is the doctrine of prophetism, that even a deed accomplished in conformity with the Divine counsel, if not performed for the sake of God and with full submission to His will, falls back upon its author, and is condemned in him. Zimri, the assassin of Elah, having, after a reign of seven days, perished in the flames of his palace, a

Digitized by Google

division of the kingdom seemed imminent, one part of the people adhering to Tibni, the other to Omri. The latter, however, succeeded in getting the upper hand, and the dynasty raised to the throne in him (929 B.C.) possessed it for more than forty years.

(1) Shechem, as we saw § 163, was already in the time of the Judges a royal city (Judg. ix. 6 sqq.). It is not said in the passage quoted, that Jeroboam transferred his residence thence to Peniel in the trans-Jordanic region, as Thenius supposes, but only that he fortified the last-named town.

(2) The situation of the town of Tirzah, which must certainly be sought farther to the north, has not as yet been more clearly ascertained.

(3) In 2 Chron. xi. 15, the setting up of Seïrim (goats, A. V. devils) as well as calves as objects of worship, is ascribed to Jeroboam; and this must either be understood as a statement that this form of idolatry also existed at that time in the nation, or we have in this passage a rhetorical expression (so Hengstenberg, *Beitr.* ii. p. 165), signifying that this calf-worship was no better than Seïrim-worship.

(4) 2 Chron. xiii. 9: "Whosoever cometh to consecrate himself with a young bullock and seven rams, the same may be a priest of them that are no gods." The passage refers to some enactment akin to that of the Mosaic law concerning the priesthood.

(5) In Amos iv. 5 the exclusion of leaven is alluded to, and thank-offerings, free-will offerings, and, v. 22, burnt-offerings and meat-offerings are mentioned. On iv. 4 see § 136, note 3. What is said in the text is of the greatest importance with respect to the criticism of the Mosaic legislation. Undoubtedly none of these institutions would have been imported from the kingdom of Judah, unless the consecration of a high antiquity had rested upon them. And how much further would not Jeroboam have gone in separating his people from the religious institutions of Jerusalem, if these had been of as recent origin as the opinion of many moderns would make them?

(6) See the explanation of this narrative in Hengstenberg's *Beitr.* ii. p. 148 sq. As little can it be doubted that the calf-

Digitized by Google

worship also had subsequently its prophets. But when Eichhorn goes so far as to assert (*Allg. Bibl. für bibl. Lit.* iii. p. 195) that the prophets of Israel did not oppose the image-worship at Dan and Bethel, and Vatke (*Religion des A. T.* p. 421) thinks that it can by no means be proved that the prophets of Israel were zealous for Jehovah, inasmuch as He was worshipped in the temple at Jerusalem, they simply ignore the facts of history (comp. on this point Hengstenberg, *id.* p. 142 sqq.).

§ 173.

The Dynasty of Omri.

Under Omri, the royal residence was transferred from Tirzah to the city of Samaria, of which he was the builder, 1 Kings xvi. 24. This well-situated city, which shortly vied in prosperity with Jerusalem, continued—though Omri's immediate successor seems to have dwelt more in Jezreel—to be from this time the capital of the kingdom (see xviii. 45, xxi. 1; 2 Kings ix. 15), which was now also called after it, the "kingdom of Samaria." Omri's *policy* was evidently directed towards obtaining peace for his kingdom, by the cultivation of friendly relations, not only with the kingdom of Judah, but also with other neighbouring states. Peace seems to have been concluded, by the sacrifice of certain Israelite towns (see the supplementary remark, 1 Kings xx. 34), with Damascene Syria, which, under the dynasty of the Hadads, had become, as Israel had already experienced under Baasha, a formidable power. The marriage of Omri's son, the weak Ahab, with the Phœnician princess Jezebel, is to be attributed to the above-named political motive. By the latter, however, who was a woman of an energetic spirit, an alteration for the worse was introduced into the kingdom after Ahab had ascended the throne. Hitherto the worship of Jehovah, though in an idolatrous form, had still been the national religion; but now the worship of Baal and Asherah was, at the instigation of the queen, set up in its

Digitized by Google

stead, a temple built for Baal in Samaria itself (xvi. 32 sq.), and (see especially xviii. 19) a vast number of the prophets of Baal and Asherah maintained among the people. Against the prophets of Jehovah, moreover, who must at that time have been numerous, a sanguinary persecution arose (vers. 4, 13), and they were put to death whenever the queen could lay hands on them. Under these circumstances the people remained passive: they halted between two opinions, as Elijah expressed it, ver. 21, *i.e.* they thought the worship of Jehovah and Baal compatible. At this period the conflict with triumphant heathenism was waged by the individual in whom was reflected the full glory of Old Testament prophetship, by Elijah the Tishbite, the Prophet of Fire, whose word burnt like a torch (as the son of Sirach designates him, xlviii. 1), and whose very name, "The Lord is my God," testified against the apostate and irresolute race. Opposing singly the royal power (1 Kings xviii. 22), while other prophets were concealing themselves, but supported in this isolation by the certainty of being the instrument of the living God, he undertook to destroy with one stroke the bulwarks of idolatry, by slaughtering the prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel, where the true God had borne testimony to His prophet (ver. 21 sqq.) (1). The dejection, however, of the zealous prophet was put to shame, when, in a night-vision on Sinai, God, who drew near to him not in the storm, not in the earthquake, not in the fire, but in a still small voice, reminded him of the Divine patience, referred him, while he thought himself the Lord's only worshipper, to the seven thousand hidden ones who had not bowed the knee to Baal, and at the same time revealed unto him, by the command to anoint Hazael to be king over Syria, and Jehu to be king over Israel, the judgment which, though it tarries, at last surely overtakes offenders (ch. xix.). The appointment of Hazael to be king of Syria—a case in which the prophetic agency was exerted in foreign politics—did not, however, take place till later; and Jehu's elevation was effected by Elisha, who was appointed by

Digitized by Google

the Divine command to succeed Elijah (2). After the vigorous measures of Elijah, the prophets again made their appearance in considerable numbers, and must (see 1 Kings xx. 13, 28) have been suffered to dwell unmolested in Samaria. They openly transacted business with the king, in whose case the occurrence on Carmel had evidently not been without effect, and who received fresh proofs of the power of the true God in the victories granted him over the Syrians in accordance with the prophetic word, and afterwards stern rebukes for his foolish and vacillating conduct to the conquered Benhadad (ch. xx.). Already, however, a multitude of *false prophets* had arisen, who said only such things as the king would like to hear; comp. the narrative in ch. xxii., where the single testimony to truth of Michaiah, the son of Imlah, is opposed to the false predictions of four hundred prophets (3). After the death of Ahab, who perished, according to the word of Michaiah (comp. § 200), in an unsuccessful battle against the Syrians, his son Ahaziah ascended the throne, walking during his short reign in the ways of his mother Jezebel, from which his brother and successor Jehoram somewhat deviated.

(1) According to Hitzig, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, i. p. 176, the water poured by Elijah over his sacrifice and its pile of wood was from a naphtha spring.

(2) The many *miracles* which appear in the history of Elijah and his successor Elisha are peculiar, no miracles being ordinarily attributed to the prophets of the Old Testament. Here, too, as well as at the exodus from Egypt, it is shown that (as pointed out, § 63) the agency of miracles was chiefly employed when the question was to oppose the worship of false gods by proving the existence of the true God.

(3) That these 400 were not the prophets of Asherah (A. V. of the groves) of 1 Kings xviii. 19, whom Elijah did not cause to be slain, nor heathen prophets at all, is evident from xxii. 16, 23. They were more probably connected with the image-worship at Bethel.

Digitized by Google

§ 174.

Schools of the Prophets, and Characteristics of the Prophetship of the Period. Fall of Jehoram. The Rechabites.

The *schools of the prophets* are now again mentioned (1), though their historical connection with the association of prophets in the time of Samuel cannot be proved. It is probable that they were revived by Elijah, for the purpose of providing a kind of religious fulcrum for the people who were cut off from the lawful sanctuary and worship at Jerusalem, and of raising up among them instruments for the maintenance of their spiritual life. Not less than three of these institutions are found within a tolerably limited area, and at the very head-quarters of idolatry, viz. at Bethel (2 Kings ii. 3), Jericho (ver. 5), and Gilgal (iv. 38),—the latter being afterwards, for want of space, transferred to the Jordan valley (vi. 1 sq.). From the last-named passage, as well as from ii. 7, 16 sq.,—in each of which fifty sons of the prophets are mentioned,—and iv. 43, a numerous occupation of these institutions may be inferred. About one hundred sons of the prophets sit before Elisha at Gilgal, and their numbers at Jericho could hardly have been less. The name בְּנֵי נְבִיאִים, *sons* of the prophets, which is not used of the association of prophets under Samuel, but first appears 1 Kings xx. 35, points to an *educational relation* (2). Eichhorn's explanation, which makes them sons properly speaking of prophets, is erroneous, for it is obvious that the prophetic office was not hereditary (3). There were, as is shown especially by the expression נַעַר, 2 Kings ix. 4, younger people among them; but besides these, as the narrative iv. 1 evidences, married men, who probably (see expositors on the passage) had their separate households; while the others, on the contrary, took their meals in common, iv. 38 sqq. From these communities the prophets seem to have traversed the

Digitized by Google

country, for the purpose of exercising their ministry among the people. The example, however, of Elisha, who, according to ii. 25, iv. 25, must have dwelt—perhaps like a hermit in a cave—for a long time upon Carmel, and subsequently, according to v. 9, vi. 32, lived in his own house in Samaria, shows that they might also permanently take up their abode away from these institutions. From what has already been said, it is also evident that membership in these schools of the prophets imposed no obligation to celibacy. For the rest, their mode of life would certainly correspond with the gravity of their vocation. Even their external appearance was to announce their opposition to worldly conformity. For while Samuel, according to 1 Sam. xv. 27, wore the מְעִיל, which recalled the official robes of the high priest, Elisha wore, according to 2 Kings i. 7 sq., a rough mantle of sheep's or goat's skin or camel's hair, and a simple, unornamented leathern girdle. Henceforth the *hairy mantle* seems to have been the mark of the prophetic vocation (comp. Isa. xx. 2, according to which Isaiah wore sackcloth like a mourner, Zech. xiii. 4, Heb. xi. 37, and what is said of the raiment of John the Baptist, Matt. iii. 4, xi. 8). Hence Elijah, when he called Elisha to be his successor, cast his mantle upon him (1 Kings xix. 19),—a symbolical action, analogous to the investiture of priests with their office, which is nowhere else mentioned. Ordinarily there seems to have been no special ceremony for consecrating prophets to their office. Anointing (with oil) is indeed mentioned 1 Kings xix. 16, but seems to have been omitted even in the case of Elisha (4). The succession to the prophetic office was not connected with any legal ceremony, nor dependent on human appointment, but is said to have rested solely on the direct call and consecration of God, Amos vii. 15, Isa. vi., Jer. i., Ezek. i. Elisha was indeed called by Elijah, but this was in virtue of a Divine command; and when Elisha entreated his master that he might be endowed with a double portion of his spirit above the other disciples of the prophet,—in other words, that he might receive the first-

Digitized by Google

born's share of the spiritual inheritance, for so must the passage 2 Kings ii. 9 be understood,—Elijah intimated that the fulfilment of this desire was not in his power, and only gave him a sign by which he might recognise that God had granted his petition (ver. 10) (5).

It is specially worthy of remark, that these schools of the prophets served the people of the northern kingdom as *a substitute for the legitimate sanctuary.* From 2 Kings iv. 23, it may be inferred that the pious betook themselves, on the new moons and Sabbaths, to the schools of the prophets; nay, from the mention of the offering of first-fruits of barley loaves and new corn, ver. 42, it may be presumed that there were some who brought to the prophets the dues prescribed in the law (for the sanctuary). With regard to maintenance, the prophets seem in general to have been left to voluntary contributions (6). Considering the great respect in which they were held by the people (comp. *e.g.* the narrative iv. 8 sqq.), though the worldly regarded them as mad, ix. 11, they could not easily have lacked support. For this reason, too, it would the more frequently happen that, after the persecution of the prophets had ceased, worthless babblers would assume the prophetic habit from covetousness, as we see to have been the case from the narrative 1 Kings xxii. Amos (vii. 12 sqq.) points to such a degenerate kind of prophetship, when, in reply to the scornful admonition of the priest in Bethel, to get fed for his prophecy in the land of Judah, he disclaims the honour of being taken for a prophet (*i.e.* one of the company of prophets) or the son of a prophet (*i.e.* a disciple of the prophets). In this passage, which is of the date of Jeroboam II., we meet for the last time with the expression בֶּן־נָבִיא, and consequently with the last trace of the schools of the prophets (7). It was from one of these that the *overthrow of the dynasty of Omri* proceeded. While king Jehoram lay sick at Jezreel, in consequence of a wound received in battle against the Syrians, Elisha, to whom Elijah had bequeathed the commission entrusted to him 1 Kings xix.

Digitized by Google

16, sent one of the sons of the prophets to anoint Jehu, a captain of the host in the besieging army before Ramoth-Gilead, king over Israel, and to charge him with the execution of the curse pronounced by Elijah on the house of Ahab (xxi. 21–29). Jezreel was immediately surprised by Jehu, with whom his comrades combined; Jehoram, his mother Jezebel, and the whole house of Ahab were slain; and the worship of Baal soon after extirpated at one blow, 2 Kings ix. sq., the prophethood thus triumphing over the apostate kingdom. Assistance was in the last instance afforded to Jehu by Jehonadab the son of Rechab, 2 Kings x. 15, 23, who is also known, from Jer. xxxv. 6, as the founder of the *Rechabites*, a kind of nomadic ascetics, belonging, according to 1 Chron. ii. 55, to the Kenites, who from the time of Moses had possessed the rights of hospitality in Israel, and must, according to the context of the passage in Chronicles, have been incorporated into a מִשְׁפָּחָה of the tribe of Judah. According to the statement of Jeremiah, the Rechabites were bound to sow no seed, to plant no vineyards, and to drink no wine. It is worthy of note that the same particulars are stated to have constituted the *νόμος* of the Nabatæans by Diodor. Sic. xix. 94. Diodorus declares the purpose of this enactment to have been the maintenance of their independence. In the case of Jehonadab, however, who appears before us as zealous for the Lord, a religious motive must undoubtedly be assumed; and he probably desired, by the commands which he imposed upon his descendants, to preserve their lives from the moral and religious corruption of town civilisation. The prohibition of cultivating the vine, the use of whose produce was forbidden, must probably be referred to the fact that this plant belongs to a state of civilisation. The now usual notion that the Rechabites were connected with Nazaritism may be correct, but there is no authority for regarding them as Nazarites properly speaking. It is worthy of remark that, according to the passage in Chronicles, families of Sopherim (writers or scribes) are said to have arisen among the

Digitized by Google

race of Kenites, descended from an ancestor named Hamath, to which the Rechabites also belonged.

(1) The schools of the prophets are first expressly mentioned under Jehoram, while the name of "sons of the prophets," given to members of these schools, already appears in the history of Ahab (1 Kings xx. 35). (Art. *Pädagogik des A. T.*)

(2) The designation disciples of wisdom, in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, is analogous. (Art. *Prophetenthum des A. T.*)

(3) The statement of Eichhorn (*id.* p. 196), that the prophetic dignity descended from father to son, and that birth gave a hereditary right of admission into the prophetic order, rests upon a misconception of the בֶּן־נָבִיא in Amos vii. 14; only one, and that an older example, being found of a son succeeding his father in the prophetic office, viz. that of Jehu the son of Hanani (1 Kings xvi. 1). The fact that the sons of the prophets are here and there called prophets (xx. 38, 41; 2 Kings ix. 4), and that in 1 Kings xx. 35 sqq. a son of the prophets appears, in virtue of "the word of the Lord" to him, to have exercised independent prophetic authority, certainly shows that the distinction between prophets and sons of the prophets was a fluctuating one, but does not authorize us entirely to deny it. The opinion of Kranichfeld (*De prophetarum societatibus*, p. 17 sq.), that the name means sons who are prophets, is linguistically untenable.

(4) Isa. lxi. 1 proves nothing in favour of the anointing of prophets, the expression being used figuratively. Hence the traditionary tenet found in many works, that kings, priests, and prophets were anointed, is, so far as the last particular is concerned, incorrect.

(5) Accordingly, when Elisha proved himself the inheritor of the spirit of Elijah, he received the respectful homage of the sons of the prophets, 2 Kings ii. 15. Of the kind of instruction given in the schools of the prophets we are told nothing; the discipline would tend above all things to inculcate unreserved obedience to the Divine word (when it proved itself to be such), and unconditional surrender to the Divine call. How strict the obedience required of prophets was, is evident

Digitized by Google

from 1 Kings xiii. 20 sqq., xx. 35 sqq., and the history of Jonah. Comp. also Jer. i. 7, xx. 7 sq.; Ezek. iii. 17 sqq.

(6) It is evident from 1 Kings xiv. 3 (comp. 1 Sam. ix. 8) that presents were offered to the prophets when their advice was sought; the narrative 2 Kings v. 20–27, and especially the words of Elisha, show, however, the unselfishness which his calling imposed upon the prophet, and how he was obliged to avoid all appearance of mercenary service. 1 Kings xiii. 16 sqq. also refers to this particular.

(7) The Second Book of Kings makes no mention of schools of the prophets after the accession of Jehu. Their cessation is probably connected with the turn taken by prophecy in the northern kingdom after the death of Elisha (see § 175).

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM JEHU TO THE OVERTHROW OF THE KINGDOM OF THE TEN TRIBES (884–720 B.C.).

§ 175.

The Dynasty of Jehu.

Jehu's dynasty maintained itself on the throne for more than a century, a longer period of occupation than that of any other. Jehu's reformation stopped half-way. The worship of Baal was indeed extirpated, but the illegal worship at Dan and Bethel, and also the Asherah (grove, A. V.) at Samaria, were left unmolested (2 Kings xiii. 6). Hence Jehu's house was, according to the prophetic word, 2 Kings x. 30, to possess the throne to the fourth generation, but then to be in its turn condemned, and to have the blood-guiltiness of extirpating Omri's dynasty avenged upon it (see Hos. i. 4) (1). The state of the kingdom under Jehu, and still more under his son and successor Jehoahaz, was in a *political* aspect a very unfortunate one; for Hazael, who had been raised according to prophecy to the throne of Damascus as a Divine scourge to Israel, repeatedly and successfully invaded the land, treating with

Digitized by Google

especial harshness the provinces east of Jordan (Amos i. 3), which were for some time subject to the kingdom of Damascus. During this period of political oppression, the opposition of the prophets was withdrawn; nay, when the kingdom was reduced to the last exremity, it was by the mouth of the prophets that Divine deliverance was once more announced, the dying Elisha first promising to the dejected Joash, the son and successor of Jehoahaz, victory over the Syrians (2 Kings xiii. 14 sqq.), and Jonah the son of Amittai subsequently predicting the restoration of the ancient boundaries of the kingdom (xiv. 25) (2). Joash was successful in his wars against Damascus and Judah; but the glory of the kingdom was still further enhanced under his valiant son Jeroboam II. (825–784), who not only restored the ancient limits of the kingdom, but even conquered a portion of Syria. External success, however, effected no internal change; on the contrary, its internal corruption continuing to increase, it was during the period in which, to human eyes, it was attaining a hitherto unparalleled prosperity, that the state, together with its royal house, was hastening towards those judgments which the prophets Amos and Hosea were raised up under Jeroboam II. to proclaim. First, it was the shepherd of Tekoa who came from Judah and testified to the tyrannical nobles of Samaria, revelling in proud security, and to the multitude trusting in their mistaken and hypocritical piety, the approach of the day of the Lord (Amos v. 10 sqq., vi. 1–6) (3). Afterwards, probably towards the end of Jeroboam the Second's reign, Hosea appeared; and when the respite granted by the prophetic word, 2 Kings x. 30, to the house of Jehu had nearly expired, he announced first to the latter, and then to the kingdom of Samaria in general, that judgment was now at hand, and continued his testimony during the terrible times beginning with Jeroboam's death.

(1) I at least can but esteem this the correct explanation of, "I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu," Hos. i. 4.

Digitized by Google

(2) The same Jonah of whom we read in the well-known book bearing his name. This prophecy is no longer extant; and it is not a very happy supposition on the part of Hitzig, that Isa. xv. is the production of the prophet Jonah.

(3) There was no lack of religious zeal among the multitudes. Pilgrimages were made to Bethel, to Gilgal, nay, even to Beersheba in the south (Amos v. 5, comp. with viii. 14); sacrifices were offered, tenths paid, and public proclamations for free-will offerings made (iv. 4 sq.); and it was thought that the Divine protection might be boasted of (v. 14), and the Divine judgments whose approach the prophet announced derisively mocked (ver. 18), because religion was supposed to be in a flourishing condition.

§ 176.

From Zachariah to the carrying away of the Ten Tribes.

That struggle between the Eastern and Western world, the first object of which was the possession of Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, began in the eighth century B.C., with the conflicts between Egypt and Assyria. Hence Amos, ch. i. sq., sees the Divine judgments rolling like a storm over all these countries, and settling with threatening violence upon the kingdom of Samaria. Assyria is, though not expressly named by this prophet, vi. 14, the nation alluded to as the instrument of the Divine chastisement. After the death of Jeroboam, dreadful disorders broke out in Samaria; see the description relating thereto in Hos. iv. If the chronological statements concerning the reigns of the monarchs of both kingdoms have been correctly transmitted, an *interregnum* in Samaria of from ten to twelve years' duration must be admitted. A comparison of several passages in Hosea and the Books of Kings shows that a dissension had arisen between the eastern and western portions of the kingdom, and that pretenders to the crown from these different parts were contending with each other. Zachariah the son of

Digitized by Google

Jeroboam fell a victim to a conspiracy six months after his accession, and thus was fulfilled the doom prophesied against his house. Shallum, the murderer of Zachariah, was himself slain, after a reign of one month, by Menahem (771 B.C.), 2 Kings xv. 13 sqq. The horrors of these days are depicted by Hosea, ch. vii. (1). Many also refer Zech. xi. 8 to this period, because the short space of one month saw three kings; but in this case another pretender to the crown, not mentioned in the historical books, would have to be admitted (2). A decided turn was now, however, given to affairs; for Menahem smoothed the way for Pul, king of Assyria, to enter the country, and thus laid the foundation of Israel's dependence on Assyria. Whether, as is the most natural view of 2 Kings xv. 19, he himself called in the assistance of that monarch for the purpose of establishing him on the throne amidst the strife of parties, or whether it was the opposite party that invoked his aid (3), Menahem purchased Pul's assistance in confirming him in the kingdom by heavy sacrifices, and this was the *first stage of the threatened judgment* (4). Israel had now placed itself upon the theatre of universal history, but only that, instead of being chastised by lesser and neighbouring nations, it might be visited by the oppressions of those universal monarchies which were chosen to be the instruments of Divine judgments, and then, when they had subserved the Divine purpose, themselves to perish, according to that law of the Divine government described especially by Isaiah, ch. x. 5. In Samaria was henceforth developed that unhappy policy which, while on the one hand courting the Assyrians, was on the other secretly combining with Egypt for the purpose of throwing off, by her assistance, the Assyrian yoke. In opposition to such diplomatic intrigues, the prophets made it their business to inculcate a higher policy, by a consistent assertion of the theocratic principle, which was simply this, that Israel should never court the protection of a worldly power, but seek assistance from God alone, whom they must, however, also fear as the

Digitized by Google

just avenger of apostasy, against whom no earthly help can defend them; while, on the other hand, if they had once entered into alliance with a heathen power, they were bound conscientiously to observe their engagements, and could under no condition expect a blessing from a breach of faith; comp. as chief passages, Hos. v. 13 sq., vii. 8–16, viii. 9 sq., x. 4, xii. 2. Such exhortations, however, found no audience; and the prophets were despised and persecuted as fools (according to the correct interpretation of Hos. ix. 7 sq.; see *e.g.* Umbreit on this passage). It was, however, no longer their office to check destruction by acts of deliverance, such as former prophets of the kingdom of the ten tribes had performed. The extirpation of the "sinful kingdom," as it is called Amos ix. 8, being irrevocably determined, and the judgment which was to be gradually accomplished already in process, all that could now be effected by the prophetic word was to place the misfortunes with which the kingdom was visited in the light of Divine judgments, to rescue by an urgent call to repentance all who would let themselves be rescued from the general ruin, and, finally, to enlighten the faithful remnant of the people concerning the final purpose of the Divine proceedings, by directing their attention to the redemption already dawning behind the dark cloud of rejection. With such testimony does Isaiah as well as Hosea accompany the history of the ten tribes till its fall. The coming ruin was hastened by Pekah, who, after slaying Pekahiah the son of Menahem, ascended the throne 759. He allied himself with the Damascene kingdom, the hereditary enemy of Israel, against Judah, probably with the hope of strengthening himself, by the overthrow of Judah and the dethronement of the house of David, against the encroaching power of Assyria. The ancient hatred of Judah and Ephraim, which had so frequently during the last two centuries led to sanguinary conflicts, was now once more to burst forth with fury, and to hasten the destruction of Ephraim. The Assyrian monarch Tiglath-pileser, whose assistance had been invoked by Ahaz, having first executed

Digitized by Google

against Damascus the judgment predicted by Amos, ch. i. 3 sqq., took the provinces east of Jordan and the northern portions of those west of this river (Galilee), and carried away the tribes inhabiting these regions into the interior of Asia, about 740 B.C. (2 Kings xv. 29). This was the *second stage of the judgment.* Isaiah (ix. 9), however, describes how the people of Samaria received all such Divine corrections with arrogance and presumption, and comforted themselves with pernicious hopes of better times (5). Hoshea, who obtained the throne by conspiring against and slaying Pekah, and who, according to 2 Kings xvii. 2, was comparatively a better king, became tributary to the Assyrian king Shalmaneser, but sought, by concluding an alliance with So, king of Egypt (the Sabakon of Herodotus), to release himself from this dependence. Shalmaneser, who was then occupied in Hither Asia, immediately marched into the land of Israel. Hoshea, after being, as it seems, summoned to the Assyrian camp to account for his conduct, was imprisoned, and Samaria attacked. But an heroic resistance must have been made in this as in all deadly struggles by the Israelites; for it was not till after a three years' siege that it was taken, and "the proud crown of the drunkards of Ephraim trodden under foot," Isa. xxviii. 3,—not, according to the modern view of Oppert, Delitzsch, etc., who thus read certain cuneiform inscriptions, by Shalmaneser, but by Sargon, mentioned Isa. xx. 1, who is said to have been his successor. The identification of the two by Ewald, opposed as it is to this view, has, however, its claims (6). The people were taken into *captivity* 720 B.C. (comp. also § 177), and thus *was the judgment accomplished* (comp. the description of this catastrophe, 2 Kings xvii. 7–23). The dwelling-places assigned to the exiles were situated in Media and the upper provinces of Assyria (ver. 6). It has been already remarked (§ 170, note 7) (7) that the continued existence of the ten tribes during the subsequent centuries is guaranteed by historical testimony; their restoration is also expressly foretold by the prophets.

Digitized by Google

(1) Hos. vii.: "It is the king's feast, in which he carouses with the princes, who deride him in their hearts, for the flame of rebellion already glimmers again in secret. All night the baker sleeps; in the morning it (the oven) glows like a flaming fire. They all glow like an oven, and devour their judges: all their kings fall; none of them calls upon me," ver. 6 sq.

(2) It need hardly be remarked that קבל־עם, 2 Kings xv. 10, cannot, as Ewald thinks, conceal a name. He smote him, it is said, "before the people."

(3) According to the notion of others, Pul entered the country because Menahem adhered to the Egyptian party. The accounts are too brief to enable us to speak decidedly.

(4) It cannot be proved from 1 Chron. v. 26, which is appealed to in this matter, that, as some suppose, a deportation now took place.

(5) Isa. ix. 10: "If the bricks have fallen, we will build with hewn stones; if the mulberry trees are cut down, we will cause cedars to succeed them." Besides Hosea, who was undoubtedly a citizen of the northern kingdom, we meet in the Old Testament with another prophet who exercised his ministry at the time in Samaria, viz. Oded, who, according to 2 Chron. xxviii. 9–15, went to meet the army of Pekah as it was returning from Judah with a multitude of captives, and, after a serious expostulation, effected the deliverance and restoration of the prisoners. The prophet Nahum also belonged, at least by birth, to the northern kingdom.

(6) We certainly are not expressly told in 2 Kings xvii. 3, xviii. 9, that the king who conquered Samaria was Shalmaneser, but the context leads us to suppose it. Oppert reads the inscriptions as declaring that Shalmaneser died before Samaria, when Sargon placed himself at the head of the army and usurped the throne. Comp. how Delitzsch on Isa. xx. carries out this theory. {The identity of Sargon and Salmanassar (Shalmaneser IV.) is discussed in a series of papers by Riehm, Sayce, Schrader, and Oppert in *Studd. u. Kritt.* 1869–1872. There seems to be now no doubt that the two monarchs are distinct. See Schrader, *Keilinschriften und A. T.* p. 155; Rawlinson, *Monarchies*, vol. ii. p. 135 ff.}

(7) Compare especially the essay of Wichelhaus, *Das Exil*

Digitized by Google

der zehn Stämme Israels, Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenl. Gesellsch. 1851, No. 4, p. 467 sqq.

§ 177.

Origin of the Samaritans.

In place of the ejected Israelites, colonies from central Asia were, according to 2 Kings xxii. 24, planted in the depopulated country, but not, as might appear from this passage, by Shalmaneser, but, as we are told Ezra iv. 2, by Esar-haddon some forty years after. These, impelled by the calamities they experienced, mingled the worship of Jehovah, as the God of the land, with the heathen religions they had brought with them from their respective homes (2 Kings xvii. 25 sqq.). Thus arose the so-called *Samaritans* or Cuthites, כּוּתִים, as they were named by the Jews, from Cuthah, the native country of a portion of them (1). *Two views* are embraced with respect to these Samaritans. According to one, they were not a purely heathen people, but a mixed race arising from the intermarriage of the new colonists with the remnant of the ten tribes which was left in the land. The other and older view, that the Samaritans proceeded from wholly heathen races, has been re-advocated especially by Hengstenberg (*Beiträge zur Einleitung*, ii. p. 4 sqq.) (2). It is certain that not much dependence can be placed upon the assertions of their Israelite descent by the later Samaritans (see *e.g.* John iv. 12), since at one time they affirmed, at another time denied it, as their interests required (see the narratives in Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 8. 6 and xii. 5. 6); while neither, on the other hand, can Jewish accounts be trusted, the hatred of the Jews for the Samaritans furnishing them with a motive for denying all kindred with the latter. The Old Testament passages, 2 Kings xvii. 24 sqq., Ezra iv. 2, 9 sq., favour the second view. In the first of these, it is evident from ver. 27 that at all events the Israelitish priesthood had been

Digitized by Google

entirely carried off; in the latter, it is of special importance that the Samaritans do not support their claim to a share in the new temple at Jerusalem by asserting their kinship to the Jews. On the other hand, it must certainly be admitted that, at least after the destruction of Samaria, a considerable Israelitish population must still have been found in the northern country. This is specially shown by 2 Chron. xxx.; for the solemn Passover of Hezekiah there mentioned was in all probability held, not (as many suppose) in the beginning of his reign, but after his sixth year, and therefore after the destruction of Samaria. Of this population, however, it must also be admitted that it was carried away by Ezar-haddon, who planted the colonists in the country. Nevertheless, even under Josiah, who, according to 2 Chron. xxxiv., destroyed the altars and images still existing in the northern regions, remnants of Manasseh, Ephraim, and of the rest of Israel are (ver. 9) assumed, and the men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria, named in Jer. xli. 5 as mourning for the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, were undoubtedly Israelites. Besides, the total deportation of the entire population of so important a district is hardly to be supposed possible. Thus much is, however, certain, that the Israelite element among the Samaritans, even reckoning the subsequent accession of Jews to their numbers (of which we shall speak in the 5th Division, § 192), must by no means be computed as so considerable as is generally the case (3).

(1) It cannot be determined with certainty whether Cuthah was, as Josephus says, a province in Persia, or, as others say, a town in Babylonia.

(2) Against Hengstenberg see Kalkar's *Die Samaritaner ein Mischvolk*, in Pelt's *theol. Mitarbeiten*, 1840, iii. p. 24 sqq.

(3) The small remnant of Samaritans still found in Nablus exhibits, according to the assertion of travellers, absolutely no approach to the Jewish physiognomy; compare Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. p. 647 sqq.

Digitized by Google

FOURTH DIVISION.

THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH.

§ 178.

Preliminary Remarks and Survey.

The history of the kingdom of Judah has a *character essentially different from that of the kingdom of Israel.* Though much smaller, especially after Idumea, the only one of the mountainous districts which at the disruption fell to the share of Judah, had gained its independence, it was still superior to the kingdom of Israel in *internal strength.* This resulted partly from its possession of the genuine sanctuary with its legitimate worship, its influential priesthood, and Levitical orders; and partly from its royal house, which, unlike most of the dynasties of the neighbouring kingdom, had not been raised to the throne by revolution, but possessed the sanction of legitimacy and a settled succession (1), and was especially consecrated by the memory of its illustrious ancestor David, and the Divine promises vouchsafed to his race. Moreover, among the nineteen monarchs (of course not counting Athaliah) who occupied the throne 387 years, from Rehoboam till the fall of the state, there were at least some individuals distinguished for high administrative talents, in whom the ideal of the theocratic kingship was revived, such as Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah. Thus the kingdom gained a moral strength that prevented the wild spirit of insurrection and discord, by which the other kingdom was disturbed, from attaining anything like the same proportions. The opposition, indeed, between the natural inclinations of the people and the moral strictness of Jehovism could not but lead to conflicts here also; nay, the contrast between the two was all the sharper, because a syncretistic intermingling of heathenism and Jehovism could not be so easily

Digitized by Google

effected,—a circumstance which explains the fact, that when the former did get the upper hand in Judah, it appeared in a still grosser form than in the kingdom of Israel. By reason, however, of the firm foundation which the continuance of the legitimate theocratic authorities afforded to Jehovism in this state, there was no need of bloody revolutions to reinstate the latter in its rights, but only of *reformations*, and these were effected not so much by the energetic interposition of prophets as by the kings themselves. Besides, the preservation of the theocratic ordinances not devolving in Judah exclusively upon the prophets, their position here was also different from that which they occupied in the kingdom of the ten tribes. At times their agency was exercised in perfect harmony with that of the two other theocratic powers; and reformations of worship being repeatedly undertaken by the kings, they were able to limit themselves to the ministry of the word. In tracing the history of the prophetic order, a distinction has been sometimes made between the prophetism of *deed* and *word* (2),—a distinction less adapted to designate two different periods than to characterize the prophetship in Judah in contradistinction to the older prophetship of the kingdom of the ten tribes. The prophets, finding in Judah the basis afforded by existing theocratic institutions, were not under the necessity of founding new kinds of support; and there is no sort of evidence that schools of the prophets, or associations such as existed in the kingdom of the ten tribes, were organized in Judah. The Rabbinists, indeed (3), make schools of the prophets exist in Judah down to the Babylonian captivity; but this arises from a confessedly erroneous interpretation of 2 Kings xxii. 14, where, by the מִשְׁנֶה (*i.e.* the lower district of the town) in which the prophetess Huldah dwelt, they understand a place of instruction (Targ. בֵּית אוּלְפָנָא) in the neighbourhood of the temple. In the historical notices of the kingdom of Judah we meet only with individual prophets, a succession of whom continues, with but inconsiderable gaps, down to the captivity; while it is

Digitized by Google

only around such eminent prophets as Isaiah (comp. viii. 16), and afterwards Jeremiah, that small circles of disciples were gathered, in whom the word of God fell upon good ground, in the midst of a rebellious nation, and was transmitted to future generations (4).

With respect to the *course of events* in the kingdom of Judah, a cursory glance presents a tolerably uniform alternation of apostasy from Jehovah and return to Him. Certain kings suffer idolatry to spring up; this finds support in the high places existing in different parts of the country, and such apostasy finds its punishment in the calamities which then overtake the nation. Then arises again a pious king, who exerts himself to keep the people in communion with the legitimate sanctuary, and vindicates the authority of the legal worship, till at length, after repeated reformations, the apostasy and corruption become so great, that judgment sets in without intermission. In fact, however, the conflict between the theocratic principle and the apostasy of the people passes through *several characteristically different stages. In the first period*, extending to Ahaz, heathenism, which was never wholly extirpated, and attained under some kings a temporary supremacy, appears in the form of the ancient Canaanitish deification of nature; the prophets, who during these two centuries are somewhat in the background, exercise their ministry during this period, so far as we know their history, in harmony with the priesthood; and the political relations of the kingdom do not extend beyond the states bordering on Palestine, among which Egypt at first appears as especially the enemy of Judah. *In the second period*, Judah, on the occasion of the momentous combination of Syria and Ephraim (comp. § 176), appears on the great stage of universal history, and is drawn into that conflict with the Assyrian monarchy in which, after experiencing terrible reverses and witnessing the destruction of the kindred nation, it was miraculously preserved by Divine interposition. The contest against the worship of nature, which, in consequence of the

Digitized by Google

religious influences proceeding from central Asia, now appears in an altered form, continues; but to the political complications of the age is added the opposition of the prophets to the false policy of the nation, and prophecy, enlarging its horizon in these stirring times, rises to a full and clear perception of the world-wide importance of the kingdom of God in Israel. *The third period* commences with the reformation under Josiah, which, after idolatry had reached its climax under Manasseh and Amon, was apparently the most thorough. This reformation was not, however, capable of effecting the revival of the deeply fallen people, and produced only an external conformity to the rites of religion. Even in earlier times, the prophets had been constrained to testify against a dead self-righteousness and an empty adherence to ceremonies; but an utter stagnation of vital religion, in which the priests as well as the people now participated, appears to be the characteristic phenomenon of the period; while, after the death of Josiah, not only did idolatry revive, but a fresh field was also opened, by the conflict between the decaying kingdom and the Chaldæan power, for the political agency of the prophets. This period closes with the fall of the state, and the carrying of the people to Babylon. During the first period we meet with no great representative of the prophetship,—Joel, who moreover belongs to a period free from idolatry, being the earliest who can be considered such. The ministry of Isaiah forms the focus of the second period; the chief prophet of the third is Jeremiah.

(1) The succession to the throne seems to have been generally determined according to the rights of primogeniture (2 Chron. xxi. 3), although exceptions occur. It is said of Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi. 21 sq.), that, after the precedent of David, he bestowed the throne upon the son of his favourite wife; and Jehoahaz, although the younger son of Josiah, was raised to the throne by the will of the people (2 Kings xxiii. 30). A regency may be assumed during the minority of a king. The Rabbinists appeal in this respect to Eccl. x. 16;

Digitized by Google

and the position filled by Jehoiada the high priest with respect to Joash was also of this nature, 2 Kings xii. 3 (§ 180) The *queen-mother* seems generally to have possessed much influence, for we find great respect shown her. The king bows himself before her (1 Kings ii. 19),—the queen-consort, on the contrary, falling down before the king, i. 16,—and she is called גְּבִירָה, queen, *κατ. ἐξ.* 1 Kings xv. 13; 2 Kings x. 13; Jer. xiii. 18, xxix. 2. Hence, on the accession of a king, the name of his mother is mentioned, 1 Kings xiv. 21, xv. 2, etc.

(2) Comp. G. Baur, *der Prophet Amos erklärt*, p. 27 sqq., etc.

(3) Comp. Alting, *Historia academiarum hebr.* p. 243.

(4) We meet with a confidential disciple in Baruch, the faithful companion of Jeremiah.

FIRST PERIOD.

FROM REHOBOAM TO AHAZ (975–741 B.C.).

§ 179.

Rehoboam to Jehoshaphat.

The history of Judah under the reign of its two first kings, Rehoboam and Abijam, or, as he is called in Chronicles, Abijah, offers little that is worthy of notice. External misfortunes were added to the internal declension promoted by the spread of idolatry,—the Egyptian king Shishak (Sesonchis among Greek writers) penetrating as far as Jerusalem, in spite of the girdle of fortresses erected by Rehoboam (1 Kings xiv. 25 sqq.) (1). The victory gained over Jeroboam by Abijah (narrated 2 Chron. xiii.) (2) afforded no adequate compensation, nor does the slight extension of the kingdom by the three districts taken from the northern kingdom seem to have been permanent. Then followed the first reformation under Asa (about 955 B.C.), to which the king was incited by the prophet Azariah the son of Oded, 2 Chron. xv. 1, after a victory over the Egypto-Ethiopian king Zerah (3),—a reformation which was not able wholly to extirpate idolatry, because it did not succeed in penetrating into all its

Digitized by Google

lurking-places. At this time appeared also the prophet Hanani, who rebuked the king, because in his war with Baasha he allied himself with Damascus instead of depending on the Divine protection, but was imprisoned for his boldness. Jehoshaphat the son of Asa, one of the best rulers of the house of David, was still more zealous for the establishment of theocratic ordinances (914–889). He organized the administration of justice, xix. 5–11, in which a distinction was now for the first time made between sacred and secular law (דְּבַר יְהוָה and דְּבַר הַמֶּלֶךְ) (4). To promote religious knowledge among the people, a commission, consisting of five high officials, two priests, and nine Levites, was sent about the country with the book of the law to instruct the people, xvii. 7–9. There was undeniably in this respect a deficiency, which needed to be supplied, in the theocratic ordinances, the dissemination of religious knowledge among the people being chiefly carried on by oral family tradition (comp. § 105). The measures of Jehoshaphat, however, as we may infer from the narrative, did not aim at any permanent institution; and there is no ground for the view, entertained by many, that we have in them the rudiments of the synagogue. Hence it is easy to understand that, as soon as a king set them a bad example, the mass of the people relapsed into that worship of nature which is undoubtedly agreeable to the sensual inclinations of mankind. Under Jehoshaphat not only did the priesthood attain great influence, but the powerful prophets Jehu and Eliezer also exercised their office during his reign (5); the Levite Jahaziel also came forward, xx. 14, entirely in the manner of a prophet. The reign of Jehoshaphat was also prosperous externally. Special danger threatened the state through an attack of the Ammonites, Moabites, and other nations dwelling on the east. It was, however, frustrated by the discord and mutual destruction of the hostile troops. The Korahite Psalms xlvii. and xlviii. probably refer to this deliverance. The affinity, however, of Jehoshaphat with the northern kingdom was a fatal mistake.

Digitized by Google

(1) About this time the above-named (§ 170) prophet Shemaiah appeared, and exercised his powerful agency at Jerusalem.

(2) We find, with Ewald, an historical germ in 2 Chron. xiii., notwithstanding the exaggerated numbers.

(3) Azariah is also intended 2 Chron. xv. 18, where a prophet Oded appears only through a textual error.

(4) In 2 Chron. xix. 8–11, Jehoshaphat is said to have set up a supreme court at Jerusalem. Its organization corresponds with the injunction, Deut. xvii. 8 sqq. It was composed of Levites, priests, and heads of tribes, over whom were placed, according to ver. 10, the High priest and a secular judge, and it was instituted to give judgment (הוֹרֶה) in all difficult cases which should be brought before it by the local courts. The president of this court was appointed according to the distinction between "matters of the Lord" and "matters of the king." It is not stated what cases belonged to the one and what to the other.

(5) Jehu the son of Hanani (2 Chron. xix. 2), already mentioned (§ 172) among the prophets who interposed in the northern kingdom, and Eliezer (xx. 37) both sternly condemned the alliance into which Jehoshaphat entered with the kings of Israel.

§ 180.

Jehoram to Jotham.

Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, one of the worst kings of Judah (1), was married to Athaliah, a daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, and, ruled by her, he became a zealous promoter of the Phœnician idolatry, 2 Chron. xxi. 11 sq., 2 Kings viii. 18, now openly practised in Jerusalem, where a temple of Baal was erected; see xi. 18. His reign was also unfortunate externally. Edom fought for and gained its independence (comp. Jo. iii. 19), and became from this time, by reason of its mortal hatred towards its kindred nation, a most dangerous neighbour (comp. Amos i. 11 sq.). The Philistines and Arabians made incursions into the country, and departed with considerable spoil

Digitized by Google

(comp. Jo. iii. 4 sqq.). In consequence of this invasion, many Jews were carried off as slaves, Jo. iii. 3, 6, Amos i. 6, and thus began about this time (between 890 and 880) the captivity of Israel (2). Jehoahaz, or (as he is also called) Ahaziah, the son of Jehoram, was involved in the fate of, along with the whole house of Ahab, meeting with his death, after a reign of scarcely one year, on the occasion of a visit which he was paying to his royal relatives in Israel (comp. § 174). The daughter of Jezebel, who was worthy of her mother, now ruled absolutely at Jerusalem. The males of David's race were at this time grievously diminished, Jehoram having (2 Chron. xxi. 2–4) slain his six brethren, and himself lost all his sons except the youngest at the incursion of the Arabians (xxi. 17, xxii. 1); see above. Finally, Athaliah utterly extirpated the male descendants of the royal race, with the exception of Joash, a young son of Ahaziah, who was saved from the fury of his grandmother by his aunt, the wife of the high priest. This child, the last scion of the house of David, was concealed six years in the temple; and it now became evident how powerful the priesthood had grown under Jehoshaphat, the deliverance of Judah being effected not by prophets but by priests. In a cautiously planned and speedily executed insurrection, Athaliah was slain and Joash raised to the throne, a renewal of the theocratic covenant and the extirpation of the worship of Baal taking place on this occasion, 2 Kings xi., 2 Chron. xxiii. (873 B.C.) (3). The guardianship of the young king was undertaken by Jehoiada; and it is to the period immediately following (about 870 B.C.) that the book of the prophet Joel must, on internal grounds, be attributed. It was a period during which the worship of Jehovah flourished, and the prophets were held in so high respect, that, on the occasion of a grievous visitation, priests and people united, at the word of a prophet, in holding a solemn fast in the temple (4). The aspect of affairs was, however, entirely changed during the second half of the reign of Joash. After the death of Jehoiada, idolatry, through the influence of the nobles,

Digitized by Google

again got the upper hand; the zealous expostulations of the prophets were unheeded; and Zachariah the son of Jehoiada was stoned by the king's command (5). After a very unsuccessful war against the Syrians, Joash fell a victim to a conspiracy (838 B.C.); and a similar fate was experienced by his son Amaziah, after a reign at first prosperous, especially in his war against the Edomites, but rendered during its further progress most unfortunate by his fatal contest against Jehoash king of Samaria (§ 175). In the latter conflict, Jerusalem itself was again conquered and plundered, 2 Kings xiv. 8–14; 2 Chron. xxv. 17 sqq. (6). Uzziah, called also Azariah, inherited the kingdom at a time of great disorder (7). But from this time the kingdom of Judah attained, during the sixty-eight years which comprise the reigns of Uzziah and his son Jotham, a degree of power such as it had not possessed since the disruption; while the sister kingdom enjoyed under Jeroboam II. but a short period of prosperity (§ 175). On the south, Edom was subdued, and the territory of Judah again extended to the Gulf of Elath; in the west, the Philistines were compelled to submit; on the east, the Moabites and Ammonites became tributaries to Judah instead of the northern kingdom. A powerful military force was raised, the country defended by fortresses, the fortifications of Jerusalem itself were strengthened, and trade and agriculture flourished (8). Still, notwithstanding the general adherence of Uzziah and Jotham to the theocratic ordinances, 2 Kings xv. 3, 34, the *moral and religious condition of the people was not satisfactory.* Luxury, pride, and oppression of the poor increased together with power and riches, while heathen superstitions and other foreign customs were at the same time disseminated. See the characteristics of the times described, Isa. ii. 5–8, 16 sqq., v. 18–23. Idolatry, too, probably of the same kind as the image-worship at Bethel, was tolerated, if not at Jerusalem, in other parts of the land,—at Beer-sheba, Amos v. 5, viii. 14; and Lachish, Mic. i. 13 (according to the probable meaning of these passages). Hence Isaiah, in spite of the scorn-

Digitized by Google

ful words of men of position, announced in the days of Jotham the coming of the day of the Lord upon all who were proud and lofty, that they might be brought low, ii. 12. The judgment already in process of infliction upon the northern kingdom was now to overtake Judah also (see especially vi. 9–13); but here, where all was not as yet corrupt, it was to be accomplished by slower degrees (9).

(1) Jehoram seems to have entered upon the government even during the life of his father. At least the difficulties here presented by the chronological statements are most easily obviated by admitting his association with his father in the government. See Schlier, *die Könige in Israel*, p. 121 sq. and 124, who, however, reads too much in 2 Chron. xxi. 4 when he makes Jehoram even take his royal father into safe custody.

(2) The Jews dispersed in the heathen world are, as is well known, called גּוֹלָה (Ezek. i. 1, iii. 11, etc.; LXX., *αἰχμαλωσία*), for which the Hellenism *διασπορά* subsequently stands.

(3) The overthrow of Athaliah and the elevation of Joash to the throne were, according to 2 Chron. xxiii. 1-11, effected by Jehoiada, through the assistance especially of the division of Levites employed in guarding the temple; while the narrative 2 Kings xi. 4–12 makes the royal bodyguard his agents. On the harmonizing of the two statements, see Keil's *Commentary on the Books of Kings*, p. 416. The extreme brevity of the narratives in the Books of Kings is also exemplified by the notice of the appointment of Levitical guards to prevent any further desecration of the Lord's house (2 Chron. xxiii. 18 sq., comp. with 2 Kings xi. 18).

(4) The contrition shown by the people awakens the prophetic hope that the final and already approaching judgment, proclaimed as the burden of Judah, may be turned against the heathen, and the return of those members of the covenant people already in dispersion, and their perfection as a spiritual church, be thus brought to pass. From the lively interest in the temple worship which characterizes this prophet, Ewald (*Proph. des A. Bundes*, i. sec. 1, p. 67, sec. 2, p. 89) thinks he was himself a priest at Jerusalem. Further evidence for the

Digitized by Google

date given above will be found in the Introduction to the Old Testament.

(5) The first example of the martyrdom of a prophet narrated in the Old Testament.

(6) Two anonymous prophets are mentioned under Amaziah, 2 Chron. xxv., one of whom forbids the king to use the mercenary soldiers hired by him from the northern kingdom against Edom, while the other rebukes him for introducing the idols of Edom, and is on this account dismissed with threats.

(7) The king in question bears the name of Uzziah in Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, and — except in a single passage — Chronicles; and that of Azariah in the 2d Book of Kings. It is scarcely possible that the latter name should be a clerical error. The most probable theory is, that he was originally called Azariah (so Schlier), and changed his name on his accession to the throne. See, on this custom of a change of name, the article *Name* in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* x. p. 194.

(8) Uzziah was, at the beginning of his reign, under the influence of the prophet Zechariah (2 Chron. xxvi. 5); but the encroachment which he subsequently attempted upon the privileges of the priests, by presuming, ver. 16 sq., in opposition to the law, Num. xviii. 7, to burn incense in the sanctuary, manifests the effort made to procure for the kingly office in Judah a position similar to that which, by its assumption of the priesthood, it occupied in the northern kingdom.

(9) In all that has preceded we meet with no prophetic agency in Judah which can be compared to the evidently more authoritative action of the prophets of the northern kingdom. The appearance of Isaiah constitutes indeed an epoch; but before proceeding to a description of his times, we must direct attention to the appearance of a new element in the development of prophetism. For with Joel, or with Obadiah,—if the latter is to be dated as early as Jehoram, that is, in the first decade of the 9th century before Christ,—*prophetic authorship* in the stricter sense, or the composition of the *prophetic books*, begins. Earlier prophets had also uttered predictions which had been written down in the historical books composed by prophets. The foundations of prophetic eschatology had already been given in a general manner in the older testimonies

Digitized by Google

of revelation. Still the gaze of the earlier prophets was fixed more on the present than the future; and their words of exhortation, menace, or promise were always directed to an immediate and practical purpose. Now, however, when that shaking of the nations was approaching by which Israel was to be drawn into the contests of the heathen world and punished for its apostasy, when the prophetic consciousness was awakening to the perception, first with respect to the northern kingdom, but soon afterwards with respect to Judah also, that the Divine counsels of redemption could not be accomplished during the present generation, but that the present form of the theocracy must, on the contrary, be destroyed, so that, after the execution of a judicial sifting of the people, the redeemed church of the future for which the nation is destined might arise,—the prophetic word attained a significance extending far beyond the present. Misunderstood and despised for the most part by contemporaries lulled into vain dreams by the flattering predictions of false prophets, it was by its historical fulfilment to accredit to coming generations the living God in His power, righteousness, and faithfulness, and was till then to serve as a light to the pious, by whose help they might, during the obscurity of the approaching seasons of judgment, be enlightened concerning the ways of the kingdom of God. For this purpose, however, it was necessary that the word of prophecy should be faithfully handed down, and this could only be done by committing it to writing. This is frequently referred by the prophets to the direct command of God (Isa. viii. 1, Hab. ii. 2 sq., Jer. xxxvi. 2); and the purpose for which such records were made, namely, to guarantee to the coming generation the veracity of the Divine word, is expressly declared (Isa. xxx. 8, Jer. xxx. 2, comp. Isa. xxxiv. 16). In some cases the writing of a prediction was directly connected with its oral announcement, as a confirmation of the latter; in which case it may sometimes have sufficed to write down, in the presence of witnesses, the few leading words in which its essence was comprised (viii. 1 sq.; perhaps xxx. 8 is also an example). In general, however, the literary work was carried on independently of the oral ministration; and certain prophets, as Amos, Hosea, Micah, probably did not till towards the close of their career work up into a systematically arranged and completed whole

Digitized by Google

the essential matter of the predictions uttered by them at different times, and thus bequeath to posterity a general representation of their prophetic agency. From the passages in which older and no longer extant predictions are referred to, as Isa. ii. 2–4, it may be concluded that the prophetic no less than the historical books have been incompletely transmitted to us. Mic. iv. 1–4 seems derived from an older source; and the prophecy concerning Moab, Isa. xv. sq., decidedly shows itself to be a summary of former Divine predictions. The traces, however, of such older and now lost portions are by no means so abundant as Ewald (*Proph. des alten Bundes*, i. sec. 1, p. 54, sec. 2, p. 69) assumes. Comp. on certain supposed references to earlier prophecies, the article *Prophetenthum des A. T.* p. 225. Finally, the assertion of Ewald, that our present collection of prophetic books is small when compared with the actual extent of prophetic literature, and only resembles the few remaining scions of some once numerous race, is certainly based upon a gross exaggeration. The chief evidence against it lies in the fact that in the Book of Jeremiah — that *librorum sacrorum interpres atque vindex*, as Küpfer aptly designates him—in which these traces of lost prophetical books are chiefly said to be found, the older matter is derived from prophetic books still preserved to us. In these remarks, one important peculiarity of the prophetic writings has been already alluded to, viz. the *connection* existing between the books,—the more recent prophets frequently appealing for confirmation of their own statements to the utterances of their predecessors, which they appropriate and enlarge upon. Thus, to cite only two examples, Amos, when foretelling judgments against the heathen nations, ch. i. 2, begins with the words of Joel iii. 16, and the later Micah with the closing words of the earlier (1 Kings xxii. 28). In almost all the prophets, references or allusions to earlier prophetic works may be pointed out, such references being comparatively most frequent in Jeremiah and Zephaniah. This circumstance, as well as the connection existing between the prophetic and historical writings, constitutes the ἀκριβὴς διαδοχή, which Josephus, *c. Ap.* i. 8, ascribes to the Old Testament prophets. And hereby do they testify to the oneness of spirit existing in them, to the oneness of the Divine word proclaimed by them and maintained during

Digitized by Google

the greatest outward changes, and to the continued validity of their yet unfulfilled predictions.

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM AHAZ TO JOSIAH (741–639 B.C.).

§ 181.

Ahaz and Hezekiah.

Its first blow fell upon the kingdom under the weak and idolatrous Ahaz, in the war undertaken against Judah by Rezin and Pekah, the confederate kings of Damascus and Samaria (1). The war broke out under Jotham, but seems to have been at first unaccompanied by important results. In the reign of Ahaz, however, Judah experienced stroke upon stroke. In the north, the Jewish forces were annihilated by Pekah in a terrible battle (2 Chron. xxviii. 5 sq.); in the south, the seaport of Elath was taken by Rezin (2 Kings xvi. 6), and the Edomites threw off the yoke, their hosts invading Judah on the south, as those of the Philistines did on the west (2 Chron. xxviii. 17 sq.). (Hence we find, in the period to which Isa. viii. transports us, nothing about the militia and other warlike preparations with which Uzziah and Jotham had protected the land.) Nothing was left to the allies but to conquer Jerusalem and dethrone the house of David. Then, when the heart of Ahaz and the heart of his people were, according to the well-known passage in Isa. vii., moved as the trees of the wood are moved by the wind, the help of the God of Israel was offered him in vain by Isaiah. Incredulously and hypocritically were the prophet's words rejected, for Ahaz had already betaken himself for aid to the Assyrian conqueror Tiglath-pileser. This (as we have seen, § 176) was certainly afforded; but Ahaz became what he had declared himself to be (2 Kings xvi. 7), the

Digitized by Google

servant of the Assyrian monarch, and the people now came under the Assyrian rod (Isa. x. 24, 27). Under Ahaz *the worship of idols* was openly practised in Jerusalem itself (2 Kings xvi. 3 sq.; 2 Chron. xxviii. 2 sqq., 23; comp. also Mic. i. 13, vi. 16) (2). Better things were to be expected of the pious and powerful Hezekiah (725–696) (3), under whom Isaiah was in full activity, and who also humbly received the testimony given at Jerusalem by the prophet Micah, the plain man from the country; comp. the narrative Jer. xxvi. 18 sq. (4). But an inward change was not to be effected among the people by an external reformation of religion as such, and the worship of idols was only exchanged for a barren zeal for rites and sacrifices; comp. Isa. i. 10 sqq. (5), xxix. 13, Mic. vi. 6. Moral corruption was especially rife among the upper classes of the theocracy, as is shown in the rebukes of the licentiousness of the nobles, the tyrannical administration of justice, the mercenary services of the priests and false prophets and the servile demagogy of the latter, by the prophets Isaiah and Micah; comp. the passages, Mic. ii. 11, ch. iii., Isa. i. 15 sqq., ix. 14 sq., xxviii. 7 sq., xxix. 20 sq., etc., to which may be added the severe words addressed to Shebna, the chief minister of Hezekiah. The violent party of the nobles in Jerusalem, who continued the unfortunate policy of Ahaz, though in an opposite direction, was most pernicious to the state. Instead of patiently submitting, as Isaiah called upon them to do (comp. x. 24, 27, xxx. 15 sqq., etc.), to the Assyrian yoke as a just punishment, and expecting in faith the help of God, this party was continually plotting to revolt from Assyria, and urging the king to ally himself with *the Egyptian kingdoms*, one of which (as appears from Isa. xxx. 4) had Tanis for its capital, and appears to have extended over Lower and Middle Egypt; while the other, consisting of Upper Egypt, was under the Cushite conqueror Tirhakah (the Tarakos of the Greeks); 2 Kings xix. 9, comp. Isa. xviii. (6). At this period, it was to Egypt and Cush that the lesser states bordering on the Mediterranean Sea generally looked for assistance against

Digitized by Google

the Assyrian power, which was gradually pressing farther and farther westward (see the characteristic passage, Isa. xx. 5) (7). The decided revolt, however, of Hezekiah from Assyria probably took place not in the reign of Shalmaneser (8), but at the time when Sennacherib, immediately after his accession, was engaged in campaigns against Babylon and Media (9). In the third year of his reign, however, and the fourteenth of Hezekiah (10), we already find Sennacherib resuming his father's project for the conquest of Egypt, and on this occasion designing to punish Judah also for its disloyalty. When, on its march towards Egypt, the Assyrian army invaded and devastated Judah, taking fortress after fortress, Hezekiah sent ambassadors to Sennacherib to sue for peace, offering to pay all that should be demanded of him. Sennacherib appears to have been pacified, and to have imposed upon Hezekiah the enormous tribute of three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold (2 Kings xviii. 13 sqq.). It seems to me that the threatenings of Isa. xxii. 1–14 must be transferred to this period, when danger was apparently averted by this payment, and Jerusalem had given itself up to frivolity and rejoicing (11). Sennacherib, however, having received the money, broke his engagement (xxxiii. 7 refers to this faithlessness of the Assyrian king), and now sent his general Tartan, with two other high officials and a portion of his army, from Lachish to Jerusalem, to demand, with insolent contempt both for Hezekiah and the God of Israel, the surrender of the capital also, on which occasion he openly announced his intention of carrying away the Jewish people (ch. xxxvi.; 2 Kings xviii. 17 sqq.). In this desperate condition (12), Hezekiah knew of no other refuge than that of prayer; and the prophet now announced an approaching act of Divine deliverance, in opposition to the scornful defiance of the living God on the part of the heathen conqueror. It took place by the destruction of the Assyrian army the very night before Sennacherib advanced to attack the city. This event probably happened in the neighbourhood of

Digitized by Google

Jerusalem, Isa. xxxvi. sq., 2 Kings xviii. sq., 2 Chron. xxxii., and may be supposed to have been effected by a pestilence (so Josephus; comp. also the narrative 2 Sam. xxiv. 16) (13). Psalms xlvi. and lxxv. apparently refer to this deliverance of Jerusalem (14). A description of this occurrence is given from an Egyptian standpoint in Herodotus, ii. 141. The deliverance is there represented as the result of the prayer of Sethon the priest-king of Egypt, when reduced to utter despair by Sennacherib's attack. A host of field-mice, he tells us, spread themselves by night over the Assyrian army, and gnawed the quivers and bows, and the straps of the shields, so that on the following day the now defenceless army took flight, and a multitude of men perished. The mouse being the well-known symbol of the ἀφανισμός, and especially of the pestilence (comp. 1 Sam. vi. 4), the story may have arisen from a misunderstanding of this symbol. Herodotus further tells us that there was in the temple of Hephæsto a stone image of Sethon with a mouse in his hand (15). The Assyrian power was now so weakened, that though Manasseh, the successor of Hezekiah, was made to feel it (probably under Esar-haddon), yet it no longer menaced Judah with any lasting injury. In its place, however, appeared, as Isaiah had, on the occasion narrated 2 Kings xx. 12 sqq., Isa. xxxix., foretold (16), the already rising Chaldee-Babylonian power, which accomplished the judgment of God against Judah,—a *Babylonian captivity* having been predicted against this nation by Micah also.

(1) This war, opening as it does a new epoch, was briefly mentioned in the history of the northern kingdom (§ 176), but must be now somewhat more particularly described. Much has been written concerning it; see especially an article by Caspari on the Syro-Ephraimite war in the *Univ.-Programm* of Christiania, 1844, with the conclusions of which, however, I do not entirely agree; also Movers (*kritische Untersuchungen über die Chronik*, 1834, pp. 144–155), who incorrectly applies Isa. i. to this period. The object of the description is to combine the

Digitized by Google

different notices in 2 Kings xvi. 5 sqq. and 2 Chron. xxviii. 5 sqq., to which must be also added Isa. vii.

(2) The priests themselves seem to have lent a helping hand to the king in this matter; comp. 2 Kings xvi. 10, and what Bertheau remarks on 2 Chron. xix. 34: "the Levites were more upright in heart to sanctify themselves than the priests." The priests had perhaps had a greater share in the introduction of the idolatrous worship by Ahaz, and therefore entered with more hesitation into the designs of Hezekiah.

(3) The authorities for the history of the twenty-nine years' reign of Hezekiah (חִזְקִיָּהוּ or יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ, abbreviated חִזְקִיָּה or יְחִזְקִיָּה, LXX. *Ἐζεκίας*) are 2 Kings xviii.–xx.; Isa. xxxvi.–xxxix.; 2 Chron. xxix.–xxxii.; with which must be combined the discourses of Isaiah referring to this period, and the Book of Micah, which was composed in the reign of Hezekiah, and probably during its first six years. Hezekiah zealously pursued two objects,—one, the elevation of the moral and religious condition of his people, by the destruction of idolatry and the restoration of the theocratic rites; the other, the re-establishment of the independence of his kingdom, by shaking off the Assyrian yoke. The former, viz. the reformation he effected, is mentioned in only a summary manner in 2 Kings xviii. 4, while it is, on the other hand, very circumstantially described 2 Chron. xxix. sqq. According to the latter, Hezekiah, so early as in the first month of the new year beginning after his accession to the throne (for so is xxix. 3 to be understood; see Caspari, *Beitr. zur Einl. in das Buch Jesaja*, p. 111), had the temple purified by priests and Levites, and then, too, assuredly broke in pieces the brazen serpent made by Moses (§ 30), to which the people had burned incense, 2 Kings xviii. 4. The worship of Jehovah was restored by solemn sacrifices, by means of which atonement was first made for the people, and then praise and thank-offerings were offered to God by the reconciled people. A great Passover was, according to 2 Chron. xxx., afterwards held, to which not only the subjects of the kingdom of Judah, but also all the members of the other tribes still dwelling in Palestine were invited, though but few availed themselves of the opportunity. Before the commencement of the festival, the idolatrous altars in Jerusalem were destroyed; and after it, all who had taken part in its celebration set forth to destroy

Digitized by Google

the monuments of idolatry throughout the country. On the probable date of the above Passover, see § 177; for the different views, see the article in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* vi. p. 152. In whatever year, however, this Passover may have been held, it is certain, from the numerous intimations in Micah and Isaiah (see them as collected in Caspari, *id.* p. 56 sq.), that in the earlier years of Hezekiah the worship of idols must have been still widely disseminated in Judah. Subsequently, too, though no heathen nor any kind of anti-theocratic worship was any longer tolerated, it was apparently as impossible as in former reformations to enforce a total extirpation of idolatry; and we find also, from 2 Kings xxiii. 13, that neither was the entire destruction of the ancient high places effected. We are further told, 2 Chron. xxxi., of the provision made by Hezekiah for the establishment of the restored rites of worship, and especially for the maintenance of the priests and Levites. Further particulars concerning this matter, and other notices referring to the priests and Levites of Hezekiah's times, will be found in the article *Leviten und Priester* in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* viii. p. 356 sq.

(4) See the explanation of the passage in Caspari, *Ueber Micha den Morasthiten*, p. 56. The occurrence must have taken place in the earlier years of Hezekiah.

(5) I take it for granted that the preface to Isaiah, ch. i., was written not in the reign of Uzziah or Jotham, but in that of Hezekiah, i. 7, which it would be unnatural to regard as a prediction, being utterly unsuitable to the former reigns, or to that of Ahaz, to whose times i. 10 sqq. has also no application.

(6) It is probable that this policy was secretly pursued by the court at Jerusalem from the beginning of Hezekiah's reign. Ver. 15 of Isa. xx., which certainly belongs to this earlier period, may allude to this fact.

(7) See the full discussion of the political relations of the times in Movers, *Phönicier*, ii. 1, p. 393 sqq.

(8) This cannot be admitted, because it would be incomprehensible that Shalmaneser, when destroying the northern kingdom, should have spared Judah, if it also had broken faith with him. The expeditions of Shalmaneser against Samaria, Phœnicia, and Palestine (for Sargon, mentioned Isa. xx. 1, is, according to § 176, identical with Shalmaneser), may certainly

Digitized by Google

have affected Judah; but of an Assyrian attack of Judea at this period we hear simply nothing. On Ewald's view, see the article quoted, p. 153.

(9) On the former, see Brandis, *Ueber den historischen Gewinn aus der Entzifferung der assyrischen Inschriften*, p. 44 sqq.

(10) According to the usual chronology, 712 or 711; according to Brandis, 700; according to Movers, even 691 B.C.

(11) Caspari, *Beiträge*, p. 153 sq., places this passage somewhat earlier. It has in fact been transferred to every possible place. Isa. i. may also have been written about this time. See further particulars in the article quoted, p. 153 sq.

(12) Hezekiah indeed zealously used every means for the defence of the city, 2 Chron. xxxii. 3–6 (comp. Isa. xxii. 9–11, in which latter passage these appear to have previously existed). See on this matter the article quoted, p. 154. But notwithstanding all, the situation of Jerusalem was, humanly speaking, past help. "This day is a day of trouble, and of rebuke, and of blasphemy; for the children are come to the birth, and there is not strength to bring forth," are the words in which Hezekiah, Isa. xxxvii. 3, describes the anxiety and despairing efforts of those days. The danger was enhanced when Sennacherib, on the report of the approach of Tirhakah, departed with his army from Lachish to Libnah, which was nearer to Jerusalem, and was now obliged by prudential reasons to make the most strenuous efforts to overcome Jerusalem, for the sake of securing his rear, Isa. xxxvii. 8 sqq., 2 Kings xix. 8 sqq.

(13) Isa. xxxvii. 36 sq., 2 Kings xix. 35 sq.: "And the angel of the Lord went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses. So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned and dwelt at Nineveh." For further particulars concerning the date and place of the Assyrian overthrow, see p. 155 of the above article.

(14) That the surrounding heathen nations also acquired, as Isaiah had predicted, xviii. 7, some idea of the greatness of the God of Israel, is shown by the notice, 2 Chron. xxxii. 23: "Many brought gifts unto the Lord to Jerusalem, and presents to Hezekiah king of Judah: so that he was magnified in the

Digitized by Google

sight of all nations from henceforth" (comp. Ps. lxxvi. 12). This event is also frequently mentioned in later writings, viz. Tob. i. 18, according to which Sennacherib, when he fled from Judah, is said in his rage to have put many Jews to death in Nineveh; also 1 Macc. vii. 41; 2 Macc. viii. 19; 3 Macc. vi. 5.

(15) See, in illustration, Hitzig, *Urgeschichte und Mythologie der Philistäer*, p. 201 sq. It is also very probable that two different occurrences are, as Ewald supposes (*Gesch. Israels*, i. sec. 3, p. 336 sqq., iii. sec. 3, p. 679 sqq.), alluded to in Herodotus and in the Old Testament. See the above article, p. 155. Isa. xxxviii. and 2 Kings xx. make the account of Hezekiah's mortal illness and miraculous cure follow immediately upon the destruction of the Assyrian host. Comp. the article cited, p. 156; the same on Hezekiah's prayer, Isa. xxxviii. 9 sqq.; and especially the treatise appended by the editors to Drechsler's *Commentary*, ii. p. 219 sq. We have no full accounts of the *second half of Hezekiah's reign* in the Old Testament. His victorious war against the Philistines, mentioned 2 Kings xviii. 8, probably took place in these later days, as may be inferred from the position of the notice concerning it with regard to ver. 7 (comp. the prophecy of Isaiah, ch. xiv. 28); it is also intimated, 2 Chron. xxxii. 22 sq., that Hezekiah secured the nation against attacks from the surrounding states. For the rest, Chronicles confines itself to a brief description of (ver. 27 sqq.) Hezekiah's subsequent riches, his measures for the defence of the city, etc. Finally must be mentioned the interest in the ancient sacred literature which Hezekiah was the means of reviving (comp. Drechsler, *Jesaja*, ii. 2, p. 221, and § 169 with note 3). He also commanded the use of the Psalms in public worship, 2 Chron. xxix. 30. On the whole, 2 Kings xviii. 5 awards to this king the commendation that "after him was none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him."

(16) See on this narrative the article cited, p. 156 sq. {For the light cast on this period from Assyrian sources, cf. Schrader, *Keilinschriften und A. T.*; Rawlinson, *Monarchies*, vol. ii.; *Records of the Past*, vol. i. Very arbitrary is Hildebrandt, *Juda's Verhältniss zu Assyrien*, etc., Marburg, 1874.}

Digitized by Google

§ 182.

Manasseh and Amon.

Judah was fast ripening for judgment under the two kings Manasseh (696–641) and Amon (641–639), who systematically set to work to overthrow the worship of Jehovah, and to establish the undisputed supremacy of idolatry. The conversion of Manasseh, related 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11, seems to have produced no decided effect upon the people, and its results were at all events frustrated by Amon. The heathenism prevailing in Judah had, however, since the days of Ahaz, attained under Assyrian influence a new character. The old Canaanite adoration of Baal, Asherah, and Astarte still, indeed, continued (see especially 2 Kings xxi. 3, 7). This was, however, subordinate to the *Assyrian worship of fire and the heavenly bodies*, which now occupied the foreground. It is true that the Canaanite (or Phœnician) worship of nature had also reference to the stars, inasmuch as they were regarded as depositaries of the powers of nature, and as the originators of all the developments and occurrences of nature. In the star-worship of Upper Asia, on the contrary, arising as it did from the Magism which tolerated no images, this dualistic origin is banished, the stars not being regarded as producing and generating powers, but only as the governors and conductors of sublunary affairs,—a notion from which astrology was developed. It was probably in connection with the worship introduced from Upper Asia, of the fire-gods Adrammelech and Anammelech, to whom children were burned, xvii. 31, that the worship of Moloch, with its sacrifices of children, formerly disseminated among the people, but now for several centuries abandoned, was resumed in Judah. Ahaz had already devoted himself to it (xvi. 3), and its chief seat was the valley of the son of Hinnom at Jerusalem (xxiii. 10; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6; Jer. vii. 13, and other passages). Ahaz also built,

Digitized by Google

according to 2 Kings xxiii. 12, altars for the worship of "the sun, the moon, and all the host of heaven," which were undoubtedly destroyed by Hezekiah; and he may perhaps have mingled such worship with that of Jehovah,—at least what is told us xvi. 10 sqq. may be so understood. Under Manasseh, however, altars for the worship of the stars were erected throughout Jerusalem; and the temple itself was dedicated to this and to the service of Asherah (xxi. 5, xxiii. 5, 11; Jer. vii. 30, comp. with viii. 2, etc.). That the religious life of the people was, by the introduction of the Upper Asian worship, raised to a higher stage of development, as Vatke *e.g.* asserts, is an utterly preposterous theory; the effect was only to increase the already existing religious syncretism, which is always a sign of weakness. From the standpoint of prophecy, the worship of the host of heaven was quite as decidedly condemned as the Canaanite idolatry (Jer. viii. 2; Zeph. i. 5; Ezek. viii. 15–17; 2 Kings xvii. 16; comp. also Job xxxi. 26–28). It is true that both priests and prophets participated in the universal degeneration of religious life (see Zeph. iii. 4; Jer. ii. 8, 26 sq.) (1); but while no trace of resistance to the abominations of Manasseh is to be discovered on the part of the priesthood, there were at least prophets who raised their voices against them, 2 Kings xxi. 10, and were among the innocent blood with which Manasseh, according to ver. 16 and xxiv. 4, filled Jerusalem. For it is with reference to these times that Jeremiah says, ch. ii. 30: "your own sword hath devoured your prophets like a destroying lion" (comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* x. 3. 1). According to tradition, Isaiah was also among the victims of Manasseh. It was because the prophets sealed their testimony with their blood that no written prophetic testimony of this date has come down to us (2). It was "the sins of Manasseh" (as is now the usual expression, 2 Kings xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3, and other passages) which, unatoned for and unpardoned, from henceforth lay as a burden upon the people, though better times once more appeared.

Digitized by Google

(1) According to 2 Kings xxiii. 8, besides the כְּמָרִים appointed (ver. 5) by the kings of Judah, Levitical priests must also have participated in the idolatrous worship at the high places. Nay, if the description given Ezek. viii. 14 sqq. is, as Hitzig supposes, to be referred to the time of Manasseh, the entire priesthood, as represented by its heads (comp. § 166, note 7), had surrendered itself to idolatry.

(2) Some place Nahum under Manasseh, a date decidedly too late (comp. § 185); the view, too, of others, that Habakkuk prophesied so early as Manasseh, has little probability. Whether a prophet of the name of Chosai prophesied under this king is more than doubtful; the word חוֹזַי, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19, rendered as a proper name in the Vulgate and Targums, being most probably to be understood appellatively (comp. ver. 18 at the end).

THIRD PERIOD.

FROM JOSIAH TO THE OVERTHROW OF THE STATE (639–588).

§ 183.

Josiah.

This period opens with the last struggle of the theocratic principle against the idolatry and immorality of the people, and with the last temporary elevation of the kingdom under Josiah (1). King Amon having fallen a victim to a conspiracy, the people arose, slew the conspirators, and placed Josiah, a child of eight years old, and son of the slaughtered monarch, on the throne. In the eighth year of his reign, says the here more accurate account of Chronicles (2 Chron. xxxiv.), Josiah, then a youth of sixteen, began to seek after the God of David his father, and in his twelfth year he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from idolatrous worship, the places for sacrificing to Moloch in the valley of Hinnom being then also destroyed and profaned (2). The reform inaugurated was not, however, thoroughly carried out till his eighteenth year. For

Digitized by Google

then, at the purging and restoration of the temple, Hilkiah the high priest found the book of the law, which during the sixty years' public supremacy of heathenism had fallen into oblivion. The king was struck with fear when he heard the curses threatened for apostasy, and the words of the prophetess Huldah, to whom he had sent to inquire (2 Kings xxii. 11 sq.). The most strenuous measures were now taken for the complete extirpation of idolatry, and extended even beyond the limits of the kingdom to the towns of the Samaritan district, the people being again bound to the covenant of their fathers, and a solemn Passover held (3). Upon this finding of the book of the law in the reign of Josiah, the following hypotheses have been founded:—That by the book of the law we are only to understand a *portion* of the Pentateuch, and that at this time Deuteronomy or a part of it was fabricated and interpolated by the priests, with the assistance of the prophets, in the interest of the reforms now undertaken. This, which is the hypothesis of Gramberg, P. von Bohlen, and others, receives no kind of support from the narrative (4), though it is probably true that the threats which alarmed the king were those contained in Deuteronomy xxviii. But the notion that the author of the Book of Kings is speaking of the finding of only a portion of the Thorah, and that it is inconceivable how the other parts of the Pentateuch should have been got rid of, is most groundless and arbitrary. That the law, of which by reason of the state of ancient literature but few copies might exist, should have fallen into oblivion in the sixty years during which the worship of Jehovah had been abrogated as the religion of the state, is so little inconceivable, that the contrary would rather be a matter of astonishment (5). This last reformation, which, in spite of the severity accompanying it, was unable to extirpate the secret worship of idols, to say nothing of the heathen inclinations of the people, effected only an external prevalence of the forms of the legitimate worship, but was unable to produce in the degenerate nation a real

Digitized by Google

purification of faith and morals. It was, as Jeremiah says, iii. 10, a turning not with the whole heart, but feignedly,—a sanctimonious hypocrisy, which thought the external restoration of the worship of God sufficient. Even the ruins of Samaria, testifying as they did to the severity of God's penal judgments, only served to confirm the delusion that the Divine protection was the more firmly pledged to Judah, and thus to harden them in their carnal security (comp. *e.g.* the stern address of the prophet Jeremiah, vii. 1–15, in reply to the boast, "The temple of the Lord is here"). The priests had indeed, as previously under Hezekiah (§ 181, note 3), offered themselves to the king as instruments in this reformation; but falsehood and hypocrisy, and a generally coarse and profane disposition, characterized the priesthood in these days (comp. the passages Jer. v. 31, vi. 13, viii. 10, xxiii. 11) (6). And while the priests were treating the law itself with neglect, nay, incurring the guilt of grossly violating it (Ezek. xxii. 26), and falsifying it by the manner in which they interpreted it (Jer. viii. 8), they boasted of it, and of those legal rites which guaranteed the permanence of the state, and whose continuance could be secured only by themselves, for the law cannot perish from the priest, xviii. 8; comp. also vii. 4 sqq., viii. 11, etc. Still it must not be forgotten that the fact that such men as the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel were found in the priestly order, is a proof that a sacred germ must have existed in the degenerate priesthood (see also Ezek. xliv. 15). Upon Jeremiah especially, whose call in the thirteenth year of Josiah (Jer. i. 2, xxv. 3) was nearly contemporary with the appearance of Zephaniah and the commencement of Josiah's reforms, devolved at this period the advocacy of the cause of God (7). After the renewal of the covenant, he undertook, as appears from xi. 1–8, by earnest addresses, to make the people of Jerusalem and of the cities of Judah conscious of the gravity of the obligation they had taken upon themselves. His testimony now accompanied the fate of the people till the fulfilment of the inevitable and approaching

Digitized by Google

judgment, for the purpose of saving, by his incisive exhortations to repentance, any of the demoralized race who might still be willing to hearken.

(1) The chief authorities for the reign of Josiah are 2 Kings xxii. sq., and 2 Chron. xxxiv. sq., in combining which the account in Chronicles must be regarded as fundamental (as was first pointed out by Movers), 2 Kings having either transposed the records employed, or ch. xxii. 3 sq. being a merely summary account.

(2) Among the later Jews, the valley of Hinnom, *Γέεννα*, was the symbol, and its name the name, of hell.

(3) When it is said of this Passover, 2 Kings xxiii. 22, "There was not holden such a Passover, from the days of the judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the kings of Israel, nor of the kings of Judah," it is not implied, as Thenius thinks, that the first celebration of the Passover after the days of the judges took place in the reign of Josiah, but only that a Passover so solemn, and in every respect so strictly in conformity with the law, had not been held in all this interval; even that held under Hezekiah (§ 181, note 3), *e.g.*, had not equalled it; see Bertheau on 2 Chron. xxxvii. 27, and Keil, *Apologet. Versuch über die Chronik*, p. 399 sq. Comp. also the similar passage concerning the Feast of Tabernacles, Neh. viii. 17. Thenius (*id.*) is equally incorrect when he further asserts that Ezekiel is *the first*, and, on the whole, *the only* prophet who mentions the Passover; for Isa. xxx. 29 must, according to the whole context, be referred to the celebration of the Passover. And how would the expression in Isa. xxix. 1 apply, if only one annual festival, viz. the Feast of Tabernacles, had been kept at Jerusalem?

(4) Even Ewald allows that Deuteronomy was written thirty or forty years previously (in Egypt). His statement is evidenced against by the traces of Deuteronomian laws found even in the kingdom of the ten tribes, and the use made of Deuteronomy by the most ancient prophets whose writings have come down to us.

(5) A parallel instance is afforded by the non-acquaintance with the Bible which existed before the Reformation, not only

Digitized by Google

among the people, but also among the priests,—Luther, *e.g.*, when a student at Erfurth, imagining the postils to contain the whole of Holy Scripture; and this notwithstanding the existence of innumerable copies, the Latin Bible having been more frequently printed than any other book. Let matters only be managed among ourselves for sixty years as many wish, and we should see how much knowledge of the gospel would be left among the people.

(6) It was chiefly with the priests that Jeremiah had from the very first to contend, i. 18, and hence that, though himself of the priestly race, he was so constantly the object of their hatred and persecution (xi. 21, xxvi. 7 sqq.).

(7) A faithful picture of the life of a prophet may be obtained from the Book of Jeremiah.

§ 184.

Profane History at this Period. Death of Josiah. Jehoahaz.

The incursion of the Scythians into Upper Asia (Herodot. i. 104 sq.), which took place in the time of Josiah, seems only to have affected the borders of Judah, and to have caused no lasting danger to the kingdom itself. It is not mentioned in the historical books of the Old Testament, and it is more than doubtful whether the prophecy of Zephaniah and Jer. iv. 27 refer to it. On the other hand, Judah was involved in the great battles which arose in connection with the fall of Nineveh. In Egypt, Psammetichus, who had strengthened the military power of the kingdom, was succeeded by Necho, who must have been the more inclined to resume his father's plans of conquest, which, as the account given Herodot. ii. 157 of the siege of Ashdod shows, were directed against Upper Asia, inasmuch as the state of affairs held out the prospect of sharing with the Medes and Babylonians, who were attacking Nineveh, the rich inheritance of the falling Assyrian kingdom. Necho appeared with an army in Palestine in 609, but with an express declaration that he was waging war with Assyria only (2 Chron. xxxv. 21). Of

Digitized by Google

course he desired not to be attacked in the rear on his march to the Euphrates. Josiah, however, was unwilling that Egyptian supremacy should be established in Hither Asia, and, advancing against Necho, sought to obstruct his march. A battle was fought between them at Megiddo, on the plain of Jezreel (comp. Herodot. ii. 159); the Jewish army was defeated, and Josiah, mortally wounded, died soon after at Jerusalem (2 Kings xxiii. 29; 2 Chron. xxxv. 20–25) (1). With him fell the last hope of the sinking state, on which account the mourning for Josiah became a proverb for the heaviest affliction (comp. Zech. xii. 11). Necho did not, it seems, at once follow up his victory over Judah, but hastened to the Euphrates. Meantime Jehoahaz (2), a younger son of Josiah, was raised by the popular choice to the throne, upon which Eliakim, the elder, gave himself up to Necho. Jehoahaz was, after a reign of three months, summoned to the Egyptian camp at Riblah, on the northern boundary of Palestine, and there imprisoned, while Eliakim was set up in his stead as an Egyptian vassal king, by the name of Jehoiakim. Jehoahaz was afterwards removed to Egypt, where he died (2 Chron. xxxvi. 1–4; 2 Kings xxiii. 31–35; Jer. xxii. 10–12).

(1) Jeremiah, we are told, 2 Chron. xxxv. 25, "lamented for Josiah; and all the singing-men and singing-women spake of Josiah in their lamentations to this day."

(2) Jehoahaz is called Shallum (שַׁלּוּם), probably, as Hengstenberg explains it, a symbolical name = he who is requited.

§ 185.

Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin.

In Jehoiakim Judah received a king who surpassed the worst of his ancestors in badness. By his love of pomp and splendour, his already impoverished people were still further exhausted (comp. the description, Jer. xxii. 13–19). Idolatry was again

Digitized by Google

openly practised, and all the reforms of Josiah were obliterated. A grievous period of affliction and persecution now set in for Jeremiah, who, though he experienced much hostility, and that indeed from his own family, seems to have exercised his public ministry without restraint under Josiah. At the first accusation, indeed, of blasphemy, brought against him after an address in the court of the temple, in which he had predicted the approaching destruction of the city and temple, he was acquitted (1), while the prophet Urijah, who had fled to Egypt to escape the wrath of the king, was brought back and executed (Jer. xxvi.). But from henceforth disgrace and persecution were heaped upon the prophet, who undauntedly and incessantly contended against the prevailing idolatry and wickedness, against the tyranny of the nobles, and against the degenerate priests and false prophets, who now appeared in great numbers, and sought by their deceptions to paralyze the testimony of the true prophet. After the destruction of Nineveh in 606 (2), in which the prophecy of Nahum, probably a younger contemporary of Isaiah, was fulfilled, *things took a new turn in Hither Asia.* The aspiring Chaldean power was not inclined to allow the Egyptians to establish themselves here; and in the fourth year of Jehoiakim (605) a decisive battle, in which Necho suffered a total defeat, was fought at Carchemish (the Circesium of the Greeks), a fortress situated on the Euphrates, comp. Jer. xlvi. 1–12, between the Egyptian and Chaldean armies, the latter of which was commanded by Nebuchadnezzar, the son of Nabopolassar (3). After this victory, all Hither Asia as far as Pelusium fell into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, 2 Kings xxiv. 7, comp. with Jer. xlvii. 6 sq. (4). Jeremiah now announced, in the spirit of prophecy, the purpose for which the Chaldean power was appointed by God, and its predetermined duration of seventy years (ch. xxv.). In this discourse the prophet hands, in the name of the Lord, the cup of trembling to all nations; and, last of all, Sheshach, *i.e.* Babylon, is also made to drink thereof (5). On the borders of Egypt,

Digitized by Google

§ 186.

Zedekiah. Fall of the State and of Jerusalem.

Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, was a weak prince, who lived in a state of dependence upon the low upstarts who had now seized upon power. He had sworn fealty to Nebuchadnezzar (2 Chron. xxxvi. 13), and had testified his submission to him, both by an embassy in the beginning of his reign (Jer. xxix. 3) and a personal visit to Babylon in the fourth year (li. 59). It was then that Jeremiah wrote his prophecy of the future destruction of Babylon, ch. l. sq., when, as is therein declared, the hammer of the world should be broken in pieces by a mightier, and delivered it to the royal courier (שַׂר־מְנוּחָה, ver. 59, is the official name; translated, a quiet prince, A. V.) to read it in Babylon, and then to cast the roll, after binding a stone to it, into the river Euphrates (1). But the king's party was meditating a revolt from Babylon, and a consultation with the ambassadors of certain neighbouring states took place at Jerusalem at this very time (Jer. xxvii. 3) (2). In vain did Jeremiah warn them, by repeatedly declaring the Divine appointment of Nebuchadnezzar to be the instrument of judgment to Judah and the surrounding nations (3). The *lying prophets*, who both in Jerusalem and among the Jews already in captivity predicted the speedily approaching end of the Babylonian servitude, found more willing listeners (Jer. xxvii.–xxix.) (4). In the ninth year of his reign, Zedekiah at last openly broke his oath, and concluded an alliance with the Egyptian king Hophra (elsewhere called Apries). Then did Ezekiel utter from his captivity his threatening words concerning Jerusalem,—ch. xvii. and xxi. belonging to this period (5). Before the Egyptian monarch had yet completed his preparations, Nebuchadnezzar appeared with an army in Palestine (Jer. xxxiv. 1–7); the country towns were destroyed, the fortresses surrounded, and Jerusalem prepared for an obstinate

Digitized by Google

resistance. Jeremiah counselled the surrender of the city. But when the Chaldee army marched against the now advancing Hophra, the newly awakened arrogance of the ruling party no longer heeded any warning. Jeremiah was cast into a prison, but secretly released by the king, and kept in the court of the prison (ch. xxxvii.). When, on the return of the Chaldean army, he renewed his threatening announcements, he was cast by the princes into a dungeon that he might there perish with hunger. Being again delivered by the king, he in vain entreated him to surrender to the Chaldees, ch. xxxviii. While, however, notwithstanding the heroic defence of the city, its danger was daily increasing, and famine was raging terribly among the besieged (comp. Lam. ii. 20, iv. 9 sq.), the voice of the prophet was lifted up in the midst of the misery that surrounded him, to proclaim with exulting confidence the glorious future awaiting the chosen people and the city of God, and to prophesy, while the ancient form of the theocracy was being destroyed and the throne of David trampled under foot, concerning the new covenant and the righteous Branch of David, Jer. xxx.–xxxiii. (6). After a siege of eighteen months, a breach being made in the fortifications, Zedekiah, with a portion of his forces, endeavoured to escape, but was brought back to Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah, and, after his sons had been executed before his eyes, was blinded and taken in chains to Babylon, xxxix. 1–7; 2 Kings xxv. 1–7; comp. also Ezek. xii. 13 (7). *The destruction of Jerusalem and the third deportation of the people* was effected by the Chaldee general Nebuzaradan (2 Kings xxv. 8 sqq.; Jer. xxxix. 8 sqq.), 588 B.C. The city and temple were burning from the seventh day of the month Ab (the fifth month of the Mosaic year) till the tenth, when their destruction was completed, according to Josephus, on the same day of the month on which the temple was, 658 years afterwards, burned by Titus (8). With ferocious exultation, the neighbouring states, and especially the Edomites, hastened to the spot, to feast their eyes upon the spectacle of the fall of this detested

Digitized by Google

people, Ps. cxxxvii. 7, Lam. iv. 21, Ezek. xxxv. 15, xxxvi. 5. The fugitives were pursued to the mountains, and laid wait for in the wilderness, Lam. iv. 19, and had to "eat their bread with the peril of their lives," v. 9 (9).

(1) A symbolical transaction, by which it was meant to declare that, as surely as this prophecy was now lying in the bed of the river, so surely was the fate of Babylon determined.

(2) It is acknowledged that in Jer. xxvii. 1, where we read Jehoiakim instead of Zedekiah, we have either a clerical error, or that this preface belongs to some other passage. Vers. 3 and 12 expressly state that this transaction occurred under Zedekiah. According to xxviii. 1, it must be assumed that the congress took place in the fourth year of Zedekiah.

(3) Jeremiah now again advocated that policy of endurance and waiting which forbade all arbitrary self-help, and regarded faithful adherence to an oath, even though taken to the heathen oppressor, as an absolute duty.

(4) According to Jer. xxviii., the special opponent of Jeremiah was the false prophet Hananiah, to whom, when he persevered, though warned, in his lying predictions, Jeremiah, in conformity with the penalty to be inflicted on false prophets (Deut. xviii. 20), announced his approaching death, which actually ensued. How emphatically Jeremiah warned the Jews already in captivity against demagogues appearing in the guise of prophets, is seen Jer. xxix., where Ahab, Zedekiah, and Shemaiah are named as such lying prophets; comp. Ezek. xiii., where ver. 9 shows that prophets appearing among the exiles are intended. It is worthy of note that, according to vers. 17–23, false prophesying was especially practised by Jewish women, who made a lucrative traffic of predictions in the name of Jehovah. It is true that females were not, as we have seen, altogether excluded from the gift of true prophecy; still *prophetesses* are a rare exception in the Old Testament. There were three, Miriam, Deborah (§ 161), and Huldah (§ 183), to whom must perhaps be added the wife of Isaiah, if נְבִיאָה, Isa. viii. 3, is to be taken in its ordinary meaning. In Seder Olam (ch. 21 sq.), forty-eight prophets and seven prophetesses are enumerated, viz., besides the three above named, Sarah, Hannah,

Digitized by Google

Abigail, and Esther; see on the Jewish enumeration of the prophets, Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. p. 17. Whether the example of heathen female soothsayers now infected Jewesses, or, as Schmieder *in loc.*, who transfers these prophetesses to Jerusalem, supposes, the great respect enjoyed by the true prophetess Huldah under Josiah, tempted other women to vaunt of possessing the gift of prophecy, must remain uncertain.

(5) See *e.g.* Ezek. xvii. 15 sqq.: "Shall he prosper? shall he escape that doeth such things? or shall he break the covenant, and be delivered? As I live, saith the Lord God, surely in the place where the king dwelleth that made him king, whose oath he despised, and whose covenant he brake, even with him in the midst of Babylon shall he die."

(6) It is said *e.g.* Jer. xxxiii. 10 sq.: "Again shall be heard in this place, which ye say it is desolate, . . . the voice of joy, and the voice of gladness, . . . the voice of them that say, Praise the Lord of hosts: for the Lord is good; for His mercy endureth for ever."

(7) Ezekiel declares, xii. 13, of Zedekiah, "I will bring him to Babylon, to the land of the Chaldeans; yet he shall not see it, and he shall die there,"—a prediction which was in this manner fulfilled.

(8) According to Josephus, *Bell. jud.* vi. 4. 5, the day on which the temple was destroyed was the 10th of the (Macedonian) month Loos, which (see Ideler, *Handb. der Chronol.* p. 400 sqq.) exactly corresponds with the Jewish month Ab. Josephus sees in this particular (*id.* and § 8, comp. *Ant.* xv. 9. 1) a proof of the tenet that, by reason of an inevitable εἱμαρμένη, a periodical occurrence of misfortune is ordained. The Talmud gives the 9th Ab. Hence this is in modern Jewish worship the day of mourning for the two destructions of the temple; when, however, it falls on the Sabbath, it is postponed till the following Sunday. Comp. the article cited in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* iv. p. 390.

(9) The usual biblical manuals cite also Obad. 10–14; but I am among those who place Obadiah at an earlier date. According to Jer. lii. 28, the deportation under Jehoiachin amounted to 3023; while in 2 Kings xxiv. 10–16, on the other hand, the numbers are computed at 18,000. In Jer.

Digitized by Google

lii. 29, it is said that at the last carrying into captivity only 832 were taken from Jerusalem. Probably only heads of families are reckoned in the passage in Jeremiah. It is not to be wondered at that the numbers were no greater, when it is remembered how many had perished by famine and the sword, and what numbers had fled from the city.

§ 187.

Gedaliah (1) *and the Remnant of the People.*

A remnant of the people, among whom was Jeremiah, who was by Nebuchadnezzar's express command treated with the greatest respect (Jer. xxxix. 11–14, xl. 1–6), was left in the land; and fields and vineyards were assigned to them by Nebuzaradan, xxxix. 10. Nebuchadnezzar placed over them as his viceroy, Gedaliah son of Ahikam (the son of Shaphan), who appears, 2 Kings xxii. 12, in high official position under Josiah, and to whom Jeremiah owed his deliverance when accused under Jehoiakim (Jer. xxiv. 24, comp. ver. 16) (2). Gedaliah, with a small Chaldee garrison, took up his abode at Mizpah, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem (3). After the departure of the Chaldean army (see Jer. xl. 7 sqq., 2 Kings xxv. 22 sqq.), a great number of Jews, who had by reason of the war been scattered in the neighbouring countries, returned to Judea. Certain Jewish captains also, and others who had borne arms against the Chaldeans, settled at Mizpah, where they were kindly received by Gedaliah, who promised them pardon and protection if they would submit to the Chaldeans. The viceroyship of Gedaliah, however, which had held out to a considerable portion of the people the prospect of the peaceable possession of their native soil, lasted only two months. One of these captains, Ishmael the son of Nethaniah, of the seed royal, instigated by Baalis king of the Ammonites, placed himself at the head of a conspiracy against Gedaliah, who, not

Digitized by Google

esteeming so base a treachery possible, and therefore rejecting the warning given him of it, was, together with the Chaldeans and Jews dwelling with him at Mizpah, slain during a banquet at which he was entertaining the conspirators (the circumstances are related Jer. xli. 1 sqq., comp. 2 Kings xxv. 25) (4). The scarcely settled Jews, fearing the vengeance of Nebuchadnezzar, then determined, in spite of the warnings of Jeremiah, to emigrate to Egypt, whither the prophet also followed them. Surrendering themselves in Egypt to the worship of idols, to the intermission of which they attributed the misfortunes of Judea (see the remarkable passage, Jer. xliv. 17 sqq.), Jeremiah was here also constrained to exercise his office of reprover, and probably terminated his storm-tossed life in this country (ch. xl.–xliv. belong to this period) (5). His predictions (xliii. 8–14, xliv. 30) were fulfilled, for in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem (584), Nebuchadnezzar invaded Egypt, slew its king, and again carried away a host of Jews to Babylon; see Josephus, *Ant.* x. 9. 7 (6). Whether this is the deportation mentioned Jer. li. 30, or whether the latter refers to a remnant still existing in Judea, cannot be determined. At all events Judea lay desolate (comp. Zech. vii. 14; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21), so far as it was not occupied by the neighbouring nations, particularly the Philistines and Edomites. The latter especially, who had long coveted the Israelite districts (Ezek. xxxv. 10), must have taken possession of the southern part of the country; see the Greek Ezra, the so-called third book of Esdras, iv. 50 (7).

(1) Comp. my article *Gedaliah* in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* iv. p. 699 sq.

(2) Undoubtedly Gedaliah also favoured Jeremiah. He was one of that party in Jerusalem which, according to the word of that prophet, regarded Zedekiah's revolt from Nebuchadnezzar as a criminal breach of faith, and considered submission to the Chaldees the only means of safety. That Nebuchadnezzar well knew those Jews who were thus minded, is shown by the friendly treatment Jeremiah experienced. This, too, explains

Digitized by Google

the confidence placed in Gedaliah by the Chaldeans, even if he had not, as some Rabbinists affirm, betaken himself to the Chaldean camp as a deserter before the taking of Jerusalem.

(3) That a place of worship was, as some affirm, immediately set up in Mizpah, cannot be inferred from Jer. xli. 5. By the house of the Lord there mentioned is probably rather to be understood the destroyed temple; see Hitzig *in loc.*, and Bertheau in his treatises on the history of the Israelites, p. 383.

(4) The occasion of this conspiracy can scarcely have been that Ishmael, as Josephus thinks (*Ant.* x. 9. 3), himself aspired to the government of the Jews; see, on the other hand, the article cited, p. 701. The motive for the deed is rather to be sought in the odium incurred by Gedaliah as the friend of the Chaldeans. The Ammonite king, however, whose tool Ishmael was, might have desired not only to get rid of the inconvenient neighbourhood of a Chaldean basis of military operations, but also to see the detested Jews utterly expelled from the country. For although, in Jer. xxvii. 3, the king of Ammon appears to have been an ally of Zedeziah in the beginning of the latter's reign, Ezek. xxv. 2 sqq. leaves no doubt of the crafty disposition of the Ammonites towards the Jews.

(5) According to patristic tradition, Jeremiah was stoned by his fellow-countrymen. Hated and abhorred during his life, his name was honoured after his death in the legends and hopes of his people. Compare the dream of the Jew Maccabæus, 2 Macc. xv. 14 sq., also Matt. xvi. 14, according to which his appearance seems to have been expected before that of Messiah.

(6) An account, the correctness of which has been impugned, but upon insufficient grounds.

(7) Hebron seems to have been possessed by them not only in the Maccabæan times, but to be also regarded as belonging to Idumea by Josephus, *Bell. jud.* iv. 9. 7.

Digitized by Google

FIFTH DIVISION.

HISTORY OF THE JEWISH NATION FROM THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY TO THE CESSATION OF PROPHECY (ABOUT 400 B.C.).

§ 188.

Condition of the People and Agency of the Prophets during the Captivity.

The condition of the Jews in captivity does not seem, so far as we can ascertain from the writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, to have been one of especial oppression (comp. *e.g.* xxix. 5–7). The people dwelt apart, maintaining their tribal distinctions, under their own elders (1). In the apocryphal narrative of Susannah, also, it is assumed that the Jews in Babylon formed a special community, with a jurisdiction of its own. A true Israelite could indeed know no real happiness at a distance from the Lord's land (Ps. cxxxvii.) (2). To such an one it would be a state of continued mourning "to eat defiled bread among the Gentiles;" Ezek. iv. 13, comp. with Hos. ix. 7 sq. (see § 136, 2, with note 2). But the same word of prophecy, whose truth was proved by the judgment which had fallen upon them, exhorted them to wait with patience for the hour when the deliverance of Israel should appear in the doom of Babylon. For this future deliverance was Israel to be preserved in captivity, to be treated like the unfaithful wife, who, though put away by her husband, might not be married to any other, and therefore received no bill of divorce (Isa. l. 1, comp. with Hos. iii.). In many, indeed, the propensity to idolatry was not even yet eradicated by the judgments that had overtaken them (see Ezek. xiv. 3 sqq., and still later, Isa. lxv. 3 sqq.). This made it all the more needful to keep the people in as decided

Digitized by Google

a state of separation as possible from their heathen surroundings. And as the Levitical worship could not be carried on upon heathen soil (see Hos. ix. 4), and the sacrifice of prayer had now to take the place of animal sacrifices, it was important to keep all the more strictly to those legal institutions whose observance was not connected with the Holy Land. Such ordinances would form a salutary fence for the people thus thrown in contact with the heathen, and a protection against a heathen mode of life; and this consideration explains why Ezekiel so emphatically insisted on the observance of the ceremonial law, and especially on the sanctification of the Sabbath (3). The example of Ezekiel, comp. xiv. 1, xx. 1, also viii. 1, xi. 25, xxiv. 19, also shows that now, when the two other theocratic offices, the kingship and priesthood, were annulled, the leadership of the people devolved exclusively on the prophets, who, by the proclamation of God's word and the delivery of prophetic counsel, afforded to the dispersion (Golah) a point of support similar to that which they had furnished to the pious in the kingdom of the ten tribes. Perhaps it was from the custom which now arose among the Israelites, of gathering around a prophet to hear the word of God, that *synagogues* (בָּתֵּי כְנֶסֶת) originated. It was during the captivity, according to Zech. vii. 3, 5, viii. 19, that four days of mournful commemoration, kept by fasting, were added to the celebration of the Sabbath, viz., 1st, The ninth day of the fourth month, because on this day (2 Kings xxv. 3, Jer. lii. 6 sq.) the Chaldeans entered Jerusalem (4); 2d, The above-mentioned tenth of the fifth month (Jer. lii. 12) (subsequently, see § 186, note 6, exchanged for the ninth), in remembrance of the destruction of the city and temple; 3d, A fast in the seventh month (Tisri), in remembrance of the murder of Gedaliah (2 Kings xxv. 25, Jer. xli. 1) (5); and also, 4th, A fast on the tenth day of the tenth month (Tebeth), because on this day (2 Kings xxv. 1, Jer. lii. 4) the siege of Jerusalem commenced.

But the prophets of God had, during the captivity, a mission

Digitized by Google

to fulfil to the heathen also. By their transportation to a heathen land, nay, to the chief seat of heathen divination, the light of the Divine word was set up among the Gentiles themselves, and an opportunity given to their soothsayers and augurs to try their powers against the revelation of the living God. The conflict waged by Jehovah against the gods of the land, when He delivered His people out of Egypt, was renewed with increased intensity at Babylon. The Gentile world was to learn by experience where the knowledge of the Divine counsel, which guides the destinies of nations and the foretelling of things yet future, were to be found, and to try by this standard the reality of its gods. To carry on this struggle was the special vocation of Daniel, who was educated at the Babylonian court in all the wisdom of the Chaldees, and raised to the highest honours; while the same contest is brought forward in the prophetic book Isaiah, ch. xl.–lxvi. From this it is evident that the oppression of the people on the part of the Chaldean rulers must have greatly increased during the course of the captivity; see xlvii. 6, li. 13, 23 (6), comp. also xiv. 3. To this two causes may have contributed,—on the one hand, the rebellious conduct of such Jews as were not willing to wait patiently for the hour of deliverance promised by God, but resorted to remedies of their own, comp. the threat ch. l. 11; on the other, the undaunted testimony borne by the prophets no less against heathenism than against the rebellious faction among the Jews themselves, comp. *e.g.* lvii. 3 sqq. The whole prophetic delineation of the servant of God, tried and glorified by sufferings (ch. xl. sqq.), is based upon that experience of suffering in captivity by which the elect remnant of the nation was purified.

(1) So, too, among those who returned from captivity, we find forthwith the Rashe-aboth (Ezra ii. 68, iv. 2), from whom proceeded the rulers (שָׂרִים) and elders (Ezra v. 9, vi. 7, x. 8, Neh. x. 1).

(2) Ps. cxxxvii. 4–6: "How shall we sing the Lord's song

Digitized by Google

in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy."

(3) Compare on this subject the didactic section, § 201.

(4) In the fourth month Tammuz, the city was also taken by Titus; and as this is said to have taken place on the seventeenth, the fast was transposed to this day, which was also reported to have been that on which Moses broke the two tables of the law on account of the transgression of the people, Mishna Taanith 4, 6 (for an explanation of this passage, comp. Geiger, *Lesestücke*, p. 31 sq.).

(5) The day is not named in the Old Testament. According to the appointments of Jewish worship, it is the third.

(6) In Isa. xlvii. 6, Babylon is thus addressed: "Thou didst show them no mercy: even upon the ancient hast thou laid very heavily thy yoke." In li. 13 it is said to the people: "Thou hast feared continually every day because of the fury of the oppressor when he prepares to destroy" (as if he were ready to destroy, A. V.).

§ 189.

Deliverance and Return of the Jews from Babylon. Commencement of the Rebuilding of the Temple.

After Cyrus had ascended the Medo-Babylonian throne, he gave the Jews permission, even in the first year of his reign, to return to Palestine and to rebuild their destroyed temple at Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22 sq., Ezra i. 1 sq.). He called upon the other inhabitants of places in which Israelites had settled to assist the travellers, and to furnish them with contributions (i. 4) for their temple, he himself restoring to them the sacred vessels (i. 7 sqq.) which Nebuchadnezzar had carried away, and assigning them not only a subsidy from the royal revenues for the rebuilding of their temple, but also materials for the restored sacrificial worship (vi. 4, 8 sqq.). According to Josephus, *Antiq.* xi. 1. 2, Cyrus was induced to act thus by being

Digitized by Google

shown the prophecy Isa. xliv. 28, which Josephus assumes to have been uttered 210 years previously (1). However unfounded this information may be declared, as it is by many, who suggest that Josephus is a very unsound authority for such statements, it cannot reasonably be denied that some such occurrence must be presupposed to explain the remarkable edict of the heathen monarch (2). If such an Israelite as Daniel was really exercising high authority at the Babylonian court, all is easily understood. And that Cyrus should have taken account of a prophecy relating to himself will be found probable, when it is considered what interest Nebuchadnezzar took in the prophetic agency of Jeremiah; and, to cite a later example, how Josephus managed to get into the favour of Vespasian, *Bell. jud.* iii. 8. 9. The explanation, however, of the edict of Cyrus attempted *e.g.* by Winer (*Realwörterbuch*, 3d ed. i. p. 241), viz. that it appeared to Cyrus that the space occupied by the Jewish colony might be more advantageously employed for the restraint and chastisement of other conquered nations, or that he desired to secure a basis of operations for his projected conquest of Egypt, etc., is utterly erroneous. To assert this is entirely to overlook the fact that the permission of Cyrus, as afterwards that of Darius Hystaspis, related solely to the restoration of the temple, which involved also to a certain degree that of the city of Jerusalem, but by no means extended to the building of the walls and fortifications (see Auberlen, *der Prophet Daniel*, p. 116). It is obvious, both from the state of the case and the further course of events, that the Persian kings showed no kind of inclination to restore Jerusalem as a fortress, in which character it had already proved so difficult to conquer, and thus afford to a nation so notorious for its tendency to revolt a firm basis of operations (3).

The return from Babylon took place under the conduct of Zerubbabel, the grandson, according to 2 Kings xxv. 27 sqq., of king Jehoiachin, who died in Babylon (4), and therefore a scion of the house of David, and, according to Ezra i. 8, the

Digitized by Google

נָשִׂיא, or hereditary prince of the tribe of Judah, who was made the Persian viceroy or פֶּחָה (pasha) (5). With him was associated, as spiritual ruler of the people, the high priest Joshua, or, as his name is also written, Jeshua. Under the direction of these men, 42,360 Israelites, Ezra ii. 64, Neh. vii. 66, reckoned from twelve years old and upwards, as we are told in the Greek Book of Ezra, v. 41, with above 7000 bondmen and bondwomen, returned to Palestine (6). These belonged for the most part to the tribe of Judah (7), and were accompanied by comparatively many priests (8) and but remarkably few Levites (9). Individuals belonging to other tribes may also have been found among the band. That these returning Israelites regarded themselves as the representatives of the twelve tribes, was afterwards shown by the offering of the twelve goats as a sin-offering for all Israel at the consecration of the temple, Ezra vi. 17 (10). The Jewish tradition in the Babylonian Talmud, that only the meanest and poorest returned, while the rich and noble remained at Babylon, may be relatively true, and also corresponds with the prophetic announcement, Zeph. iii. 12 (11). The returned Jews at first assembled for the worship of God at an altar set up for the purpose, Ezra iii. 2, and regular sacrificial service began, according to ver. 6, on the first day of the seventh month. It is possible that this circumstance may have given rise to the celebration of the first of Tisri, the new-moon Sabbath, as the first day of the civil year; and we afterwards find a solemn celebration of this day by the reading of the law by Ezra, and the rejoicings connected therewith, spoken of Neh. viii. 1, 9–12 (12). Preparations were immediately made for the rebuilding of the temple (Ezra ii. 68 sq., iii. 7–9). It was a time of hearty enthusiasm, which showed itself more especially at the laying of the foundations of the temple in the second month of the following year (iii. 3–10). Perhaps the anonymous psalms of rejoicing, xcvi.–xcix., which proclaim the speedy coming of the Lord to judge the heathen and to set up His kingdom upon

Digitized by Google

earth, belong to this period. Ps. cxi. 14 sq. is a testimony to the hopes then entertained (13). The newly settled nation was, however, to experience grievous trials. The Samaritans, whose desire to obtain a share in the new temple was rejected, revenged themselves by intriguing at the Persian court to hinder the building, which now ceased till the second year of Darius Hystaspis (Ezra iv. 1-5).

(1) In Isa. xliv. 28, the Lord says of Cyrus: "He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid."

(2) The edict Ezra i. 2 begins thus: "Jehovah, the God of heaven, hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and He hath charged me to build Him an house at Jerusalem which is in Judah." Herodotus also makes oracles play a considerable part in the history of the life of Cyrus.

(3) The act of Cyrus, according to the descriptions given in the most ancient accounts, can only be explained by the *religious* interest which he took in the Jews.

(4) By his son Pedaiah, according to 1 Chron. iii. 19, by Shealtiel according to Ezra iii. 2, Zerubbabel being esteemed the son of the latter, either by reason of a levirate marriage, or because he had been adopted by him.

(5) He is also called Sheshbazzar, a Chaldee name, probably bestowed on him as a similar one was on Daniel. His Hebrew name Zerubbabel probably = זְרוּעַ בָּבֶל, *Babylone genitus*.

(6) Persian cavalry had accompanied the travellers to put them in possession of Jerusalem. As soon, however, as they arrived, they dispersed for the purpose of seeking the hereditary settlements of their families. The statements, Ezra ii. 70, Neh. vii. 6, that every one returned to his city, must not, however, be understood in their strictest sense, for the region taken possession of by the new colony was by no means co-extensive with that possessed by the kingdom of Judah before the captivity, but seems, as may especially be inferred from the names of the towns mentioned Ezra ii. 20 sqq. and Neh. viii. 25 sqq., to have been on the whole limited to Jerusalem and the neighbouring districts, which had formed the lot of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin

Digitized by Google

(7) See Neh. xi. The separation between Israel and Judah had been continued even in captivity by their transportation to different regions.

(8) This circumstance shows how greatly during the captivity, into which a portion of the priesthood had been carried so early as the deportation under Jehoiachin (§ 185; Jer. xxix. 1, Ezek. i. 3), an attachment to the religion of their fathers had been strengthened, more especially among the priests. According to Ezra ii. 36 sqq., Neh. vii. 39–42, out of the four races of priests, viz. that of Jedaiah, to which the high priest Joshua belonged, Immer, Pashur, and Harim, 4289 priests returned with Zerubbabel, to which must be added individuals of other races. See further particulars in the article *Priesterthum des A. T.* in Herzog's *Realencykl.* xii. p. 184 sqq.

(9) According to Ezra ii. 40 sqq., 74 of the first class, who are called Levites in the stricter sense, 128 of the class of singers, 139 of that of doorkeepers—in all, 341; according to Neh. vii. 43 sqq., there were 74 Levites, 148 singers, and 138 doorkeepers, making together 360. See some further statements concerning these Levites in the article *Levi, Leviten*, in Herzog, viii. p. 357.

(10) This is also shown by the offerings of those who came up with Ezra (Ezra viii. 35). The circumstance, too, that twelve heads of houses, including Zerubbabel and Joshua, presided over the first band of travellers, might be explained on this ground. (See Neh. vii. 7, by which Ezra ii. 2 must be completed, and the Greek Ezra, v. 8.) How much was thought in the newly assembled community of being able to show a pure Israelite descent, is obvious from Ezra ii. 59 sqq. The want of genealogical authentication in the case of priests, however, involved only a suspension of priestly privileges; and it is not said that "they who could not show their father's house and their seed whether they were of Israel," were excluded from the congregation. The colony also included, according to vi. 21, Neh. x. 29, proselytes "who had separated themselves from the filthiness of the heathen to seek the Lord God of Israel." That care was continually taken to keep the tribes distinct, is shown by the list of the people in Nehemiah's days. It records, however, those only who belonged to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, all others being comprised

Digitized by Google

under the indefinite expression שְׁאָר יִשְׂרָאֵל. The genealogies of the ten tribes may for the most part have been lost, though in the New Testament, Luke ii. 36, a woman of the tribe of Asher is spoken of.

(11) The statements concerning the contributions for the temple show, however (Ezra ii. 68 sq., Neh. vii. 70–72), that there were also opulent persons among them.

(12) Comp. § 150, and see further particulars in the article *Feste der späteren Juden* in Herzog, iv. p. 387 sq.

(13) Ps. cii. is usually assigned to the latter times of the captivity: to me it seems more probably to belong to the day of small things after the return. It is said, ver. 13 sq.: "Thou shalt arise and have mercy on Zion; for the time to favour her, yea, the set time, is come. For Thy servants take pleasure in her stones," etc. The Lord had "looked down from the heights of His sanctuary, . . . to hear the groaning of the prisoner, to loose those appointed unto death;" therefore the people might now also expect the further accomplishment of the prophetic word, the appearing of the glory of Zion, and the association of all nations in the service of the Lord (comp. vers. 20–23).

§ 190.

The Period from Cyrus to Darius Hystaspis.

Of this interval we have no accounts. It is true that, according to the theory formerly prevailing, and still advocated by Ewald, Köhler, and others, the section Ezra iv. 6–23 is made to refer to this period, by Ahashverosh being taken for Cambyses, and Artachshashta for the Pseudo-Smerdis (1). But it is only by the most arbitrary assumption that the names in question can be referred to other kings than those who bear these names in other parts of the Old Testament. Hence here, as elsewhere, Ahashverosh is Xerxes, and Artachshashta Artaxerxes; and this section, which was interpolated at the editing of the Hebrew Ezra, treats of an opposition first raised against the building of the *city* of Jerusalem and its walls

Digitized by Google

under the Persian kings there named (2). In the whole period from Cyrus to Darius Hystaspis, only hindrances to the *building of the temple* are mentioned, and iv. 5 should be immediately followed by ver. 24. In the sixth month of the second year of Darius, 520 B.C., the prophet Haggai was raised up (3) to encourage the viceroy Zerubbabel by prophecy; to press upon the people, of whom indolence and dejection had taken possession, the resumption of the building of the temple; and to revive their hopes of the promised redemption (Hag. i.) (4). When, however, the meanness of the building (ii. 3, comp. with Zech. iv. 10) produced fresh despondency, the people were comforted by Haggai, and Zechariah, who was commissioned two months after him, by the consideration that the day of small things must not be despised, because success came not by might nor by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord (Zech. iv. 1–6, comp. Hag. ii. 5). As, in spite of all difficulties, the building of the temple would now be successfully accomplished (Zech. iv. 7–9), so also was redemption assured to them. As yet, indeed, the heathen were dwelling in proud security, and Judah was in a state of humiliation (i. 8–13); but soon would take place that great shaking of the nations, in which the heathen powers would wear each other out (Hag. ii. 6, 21, comp. with Zech. ii. 1–4). Then would the kingdom of God, into which the Gentiles should be incorporated, and to which they should dedicate all their treasures, triumph (Hag. ii. 7 sq., Zech. viii. 20–23). For the covenant people, however, a new sifting and purification was ordained, for this is the meaning of the vision v. 1–11 (5). When the building of the temple, in reliance upon Divine protection, was thus resumed, the Persian officials on this side the Euphrates at first permitted the matter to be proceeded with, until the royal decision should be ascertained. The decree of Cyrus being found among the archives at Ecbatana, this decision was favourable to the Jews, Darius commanding not only that the building of the temple should not be hindered, but also granting state

Digitized by Google

assistance both for this purpose and for the regular maintenance of the sacrifices. The building consequently proceeded, and the temple was finished and dedicated in the sixth year of Darius, 516 B.C., Ezra v. sq.

(1) See Köhler, *die Weissagungen Haggai's*, p. 17 sqq. Kleinert (*Dorpater Beiträge zu den theol. Wissenschaften*, i. p. 5 sqq.) first pointed out the correct view, and F. W. Schultz (in his article *Cyrus der Grosse, Stud. und Kritik.* 1835, p. 685 sqq.) and Bertheau (*Exeget. Handbuch zu Esra, Nehemia, und Esther*, p. 69 sqq.) have more particularly discussed the matter. Hengstenberg and Keil are of the same opinion.

(2) In the so-called Third Book of Ezra, the whole section stands in a different place.

(3) The part taken by the watchmen of Israel (comp. Isa. lii. 8, etc.) at the return of the people to the Holy Land is not known to us, our information concerning the ministrations of the prophets after the captivity commencing only at this epoch.

(4) We have no certain information concerning the personal circumstances of Haggai (חַגַּי, LXX. Ἀγγαῖος) beyond what we are told in his writings and in Ezra v. 1, vi. 14. Perhaps he was one of the old men who had seen the former temple in its glory (Hag. ii. 3). On later traditions in Dorotheus and Pseudo-Epiphanius and in the Talmud, as well as on the contents of his book, composed as it is in unadorned language, but not without rhetorical vividness, especially in its employment of the interrogative form, see the article *Haggai* in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* v. p. 471. In the LXX. the names of both Haggai and Zechariah appear in the titles of certain psalms (cxxxviii., cxlvi.–cxlix.); in the Vulgate, in those of Ps. cxii. (cxi.) and cxlvi. (cxlv.).

(5) It should be remembered that these predictions were uttered not long before the commencement of the Persian wars, which introduced that shaking of the nations in which ancient history in course of time terminated. The authority at this time exercised by the prophets is testified not only by the resumption of the building of the temple at their word, but also by Zech. vii. 3. No other prophets are mentioned till the days of Nehemiah.

Digitized by Google

§ 191.

The Jews under Xerxes. Beginning of Ezra's Administration.

We have no information concerning the condition of the people in Palestine during the next fifty-eight years, except the short paragraph Ezra iv. 6, which, as above remarked, refers to the time of Xerxes (1). To fill up the gap with certain psalms, as Ewald does, who transposes Ps. lxxxix., xlix., lxxiv., lxxix., lx., lxxxv. to this period, is an uncertain hypothesis, even though these psalms may present, as will be shown, a certain adaptation to the circumstances of the times (2). Nor is there any better historical authority for relegating, with certain Fathers of the Church, as Theodoret and Theodore of Mopsuestia, the fulfilment of the predictions concerning Gog and Magog, Ezek. xxxviii., with those also of Jo. iii., Mic. iv. 11, to the times of Zerubbabel, and consequently speaking of a Scythian invasion and of great conflicts between the Jews and the surrounding nations as then taking place (3). On the other hand, the occurrence *in Persia* to which the Book of Esther refers, does belong to this period, viz. to the reign of Xerxes. That an historical germ cannot but be acknowledged in this book, is testified by the existence of the Feast of Purim (4). Its historical value, however, consists rather in the contribution it affords towards our knowledge of later Judaism; and Bertheau justly dwells upon the contrast presented by the Israel to whom, according to Isa. xl. sqq., is committed the mission of setting up the kingdom of God among the Gentiles, and the Jewish people as here depicted (5).

In the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus, the thread of the history of the Jewish settlement in the Holy Land is again taken up, viz. first by the Book of Ezra, ch. vii., at the seventh year of this monarch (458 B.C.). We find the colony in Palestine in a state of great depression. The Jewish district had, it is true, extended towards the south (6); but the condition of the people

Digitized by Google

was an extremely sad one, by reason of the heavy burdens imposed upon them under the arbitrary sway of the Persian governors, Neh. v. 15 (7). Internal disorders also prevailed; the ordinances of the law, which, comparatively speaking, had not as yet been revived, were neglected; and the lukewarmness of the people was especially shown by their contracting marriages with the heathen who dwelt in their neighbourhood, and also in some instances among them. The utter wretchedness of the times may be perceived from the Book Ecclesiastes, which was probably written at this date (8). Things took a turn for the better, when, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (not of Xerxes, as some, after the example of Josephus, have supposed), the priest and scribe Ezra led a second band of Israelites into Judea. The number of those who then returned was composed, according to Ezra viii., of 1596 members of twelve houses, besides (vii. 7) priests and Levites (of the three classes). But at this time also, as appears from viii. 15, there was but little willingness on the part of the Levites to return. This strange phenomenon may be explained (see Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israels von der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels*, p. 204) by supposing either that the Levites, who, as we learn from Ezek. xliv. 9 sqq. and xlviii. 11, must in the pre-Babylonian period have been even more deeply involved in idolatry than the priests (9), united themselves during the captivity with the heathenistic party among the people; or that the jealousy entertained by them at the preference of the Aaronic race, which, according to the Pentateuch, dated from the earliest times, was still influencing them (10). The royal authority committed to Ezra (vii. 11) is another proof that the interest taken in the Jews by the Persian kings was a religious one. To provide for the restoration of the legal worship was the first object; and all the expenses needed to secure this purpose were, so far as they were not covered by voluntary contributions, to be furnished at the cost of the state (11). Ezra was strictly to enforce the observance of the Mosaic law as well as of the commands of the

Digitized by Google

king upon all Israelites dwelling in the provinces beyond the Euphrates. Ezra began his work of reformation by the dismissal of all the heathen wives,—a measure which, as may be seen from the description of the law, § 102, was carried out to an extent considerably surpassing the prohibitions of the Mosaic law concerning mixed marriages. Of Ezra's subsequent administration during the next twelve years, nothing is narrated (12). What happened during this period may be inferred from the record (Ezra iv. 7–23), which, as remarked § 190, is of this date compared with Neh. i. sq., for Neh. i. 3 cannot but produce an impression that occurrences then quite recent are there spoken of (13). Hence a new and heavy trial must have fallen upon the Jews, who during this time must have attempted to fortify Jerusalem, for which they had as yet no permission from the Persian kings (14). The mistrust of the Persian officials being excited by this conduct, they induced Artaxerxes to prohibit the fortification of Jerusalem, and, with the assistance of the hostile neighbouring states, carried his decree into execution by destroying such portions as were already built. At this point the narrative of the Book of Nehemiah commences.

(1) This gap in the history does not exist with the Rabbinists, who have never been distinguished for chronological accuracy, and who *bonâ fide* jumble together Ezra and Nehemiah with Zerubbabel and his contemporaries.

(2) See Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israels*, i. sec. 3, p. 138 sqq., iii. sec. 4, p. 155 sqq. According to this view, Jerusalem was at this time most grievously injured and despised by the neighbouring states, the temple itself damaged, and the whole country devastated.

(3) When Theodoret makes Zerubbabel also conquer the enemy and finish the temple at Jerusalem with the spoil, it is obvious that these statements, for which he appeals to ancient authorities, are mainly derived from these very prophetic passages. No certainty can in any way be obtained but by recurring to the Book of Nehemiah, of which hereafter.

(4) For, as Winer (*Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, iii. sec. 1, p. 351)

Digitized by Google

remarks, "Festivals are not so easily introduced among whole nations, as suspicious circumstances are detected in the records of antiquity by the student sitting in his study with the modern standard in his hand." On the meaning of the name יְמֵי הַפּוּרִים, see Esth. ix. 24–26, comp. iii. 7. The feast is mentioned by the name of ἡ Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα so early as 2 Macc. xv. 36. It seems at first to have encountered some opposition; at least Talm. Hieros. *Megilla*, f. 70. 4, says that eighty-five elders, among whom were thirty prophets, derided its introduction as an unauthorized innovation. In the time of Josephus, however (*Ant.* xi. 6. 13), the feast, and indeed on both its days, was already universally observed by the Jews. For particulars concerning its celebration, see the article *Feste der späteren Juden* in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* iv. p. 388.

(5) See Bertheau, *Exeget. Handbuch zu den Büchern Esra, Nehemiah, und Esther*, p. 287. The book "clearly and loudly testifies that the people to whom the conquest of the world was promised were departing further and further from communion with the living God, were trusting to their own arm and to earthly power, and consequently must succumb in the conflict with the powers of the world." The more particular features of the book are discussed in the introduction. It is remarkable that in the Hebrew text the name of God never occurs; in the LXX., on the contrary, it is once or twice met with. The canonicity of this book was disputed in Christian antiquity, and it is well known how low a position was assigned to it by Luther (*de servo arbitrio*). Compare also the article *Kanon des A. T.* in Herzog, vii. pp. 251, 258.

(6) See Neh. xi. 25 sqq. According to ver. 30 of this passage, the children of Judah dwelt from Beer-sheba unto the valley of Hinnom, that is, from the southern boundary of the former Jewish state to the valley of Hinnom.

(7) Palestine must also undoubtedly have borne its share in the sacrifices exacted for the contest waged by the Persian monarchy against Greece; and the more so, since, according to Herodotus, vii. 89, a portion of the fleet of Xerxes was equipped in its ports.

(8) See Hengstenberg, *Der Prediger Salomo*, p. 12 sqq., and Kleinert, *Der Prediger Salomo, Programm des Friedr.-Wilh.-Gymn. in Berlin*, 1864, in which, p. 25 sqq., the circumstances

Digitized by Google

of those days are excellently discussed. Hengstenberg goes somewhat too far in the manner in which he elucidates the book from Persian history; still he has contributed much apt illustration. The canonicity of Ecclesiastes was a matter of dispute so late as the end of the first century after Christ, when it was first firmly established; comp. the article *Kanon des A. T.* p. 251 sq. The book is not quoted in the New Testament.

(9) A confusion of the priestly and Levitical offices must at this time have also taken place; at least, unless this is assumed, the passages Ezek. xliv. 9 sqq., xl. 11, can hardly be satisfactorily explained. For after Ezekiel had already, xl. 46, xliii. 19, explicitly stated that among the Levites only the descendants of Zadok might approach the Lord in priestly service, the passage quoted announces to the Levites, as a punishment for their apostasy to idolatry, that in the new temple they are to be utterly excluded from all priestly functions, and only employed in the performance of humbler offices.

(10) According to a Jewish tradition (see Surenhus on *Mishna Sota*, 9. 10), Ezra is said to have punished the Levites for their backwardness, by depriving them of the tithes; this is, however, directly opposed to Neh. x. 38, xiii. 10.

(11) It is said in the edict of the Persian king, Ezra vii. 23: "Whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, let it be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven: for why should there be wrath against the realm of the king and his sons?"

(12) For what is narrated from Neh. vii. 73 onwards did not take place, as might be supposed from its position in the Third Book of Ezra ix. 39 sqq., in the second year of Ezra, but stands, as far as chronology is concerned, in its right place in the Book of Nehemiah (see Bertheau, *id.* p. 205 sqq.).

(13) See the discussion of this matter in Bertheau, *id.* p. 130 sqq. Keil also regards Neh. i. 3 as referring to the Chaldee destruction. But to return to the matter itself. Jews arrive at Susa from Jerusalem. Nehemiah inquires how things are going on there, and they begin to complain. And their complaint would run somewhat thus: The walls of Jerusalem (which were destroyed 140 years ago) are not yet rebuilt, and the gates still lie there burned up. We are indebted to Bertheau, with whom I entirely agree, *id.*, for having first placed

Digitized by Google

this in its true light, and thus assigned the paragraph Ezra iv. 7 sqq. to its right place.

(14) An attempt which is easily to be explained by the efforts excited among the people by Ezra to keep up a strict separation between themselves and their heathen neighbours, on the ground of Mosaic institutions, and one, moreover, which, considering the friendly disposition shown by the Persian monarch in the mission of Ezra, was likely to be attended with success.

§ 192.

Ezra and Nehemiah. The Close of Prophecy.

Nehemiah, who was sent by Artaxerxes in the twentieth year of that monarch's reign, with the authority of governor, to Jerusalem, effected the restoration of the walls and gates of Jerusalem (ch. iii. sq.), notwithstanding the opposition he encountered from individuals hostile to the Jews (Neh. ii. 10, 19), and who, as we learn from vi. 17 sq., xiii. 4, 28, had adherents even among the chief men in the city. He next set heartily to work at the removal of internal sores. He had to deal with a needy proletariat, which had suffered much ill-usage at the hand of wealthy usurers, and was much exasperated against its opulent oppressors (v. 2, 5) (1). Nehemiah put a stop to usury, effected a restoration of mortgaged estates (vers. 6–13), and took vigorous measures for the maintenance of security and order (ch. vii.). Ezra also now began to act in his capacity of a teacher of the law (ch. viii.). On a day of general fasting, the people were bound by oath to the observance of the law, for which purpose a document was drawn up and signed by Nehemiah, the heads of the priests, the Levites (2), and the rest of the people (ch. ix. 1) (3). Ezra, as being the imposer of the obligation upon the people, was not himself among those who signed. He occupied a position similar to that of Moses when the people first bound themselves to the covenant (Ex. xxiv.); and yet *how utterly*

Digitized by Google

were circumstances now changed! Then a mediator of the covenant, commissioned immediately by Jehovah, and authenticated as such by great acts of Divine revelation; now a man who had received his authority from a heathen king, for Ezra was no instrument of revelation. Then a people redeemed from heathen bondage, and assured of the effectual indwelling of its God; now a scanty remnant, obliged to confess, Neh. ix. 36 sq., "Behold, we are servants this day; and the land that Thou gavest our fathers to eat the fruit thereof, behold, we are servants in it: and it yieldeth much increase to the kings whom Thou hast set over us because of our sins." The written law had taken the place of the shekinah of the God-King, whose pledges, the ark and the Urim and Thummim, were lacking to the new community, and the people now testify their reverence for the roll of the Thorah (viii. 5). To Ezra must be attributed not a *re-foundation of the theocracy*, but only a *restoration of the ordinances of the law*, which was now fenced about by further restrictions—the סיג התורה—to guard against the infraction of the commandments. An example of this is found in the interposition beyond the limits of the Mosaic law, on the part of Ezra and Nehemiah, with regard to the mixed marriages, —a measure the severity of which was justified by a reference to the example of Solomon, xiii. 26. Ezra was the *founder of Judaism proper;* and in this very fact lies his great *importance in the history also of the kingdom of God.* For the restoration, through his instrumentality, of those ordinances which formed the wall of partition that separated the people from the Gentiles, was the means of preserving the unity of the nation, to which not only the preservation of the λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, Rom. iii. 2, was committed till their fulfilment, but from which also was to arise that λεῖμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος, xi. 5, which formed the stock of the new church of the redeemed (4).

After a twelve years' sojourn in Palestine (433 B.C.), Nehemiah returned to Persia. But new abuses sprang up during his absence, and he returned for the second time,—when, can-

Digitized by Google

not be certainly determined; but as הַמֶּלֶךְ in Neh. xiii. 6 most naturally refers to Artaxerxes, it was probably before the death of that monarch, *i.e.* before 424 B.C., though, according to another view, not till the reign of Darius Nothus. Energetic measures were then taken to restore order; and Nehemiah even cast out the grandson of Eliashib the high priest, because he had married a daughter of Sanballat, who was probably a Samaritan, and, according to Josephus, the Persian satrap of Samaria (5). This expelled priest is undoubtedly the same individual with Manasseh, of whom Josephus speaks, *Ant.* xi. 8, as the founder of the Samaritan temple upon Mount Gerizim, though he erroneously refers this matter to the times of Darius Codomanus (whom he confounds with Darius Nothus) and Alexander the Great (6). The Samaritans were now strengthened by the accession of many other discontented Jews who had contracted mixed marriages, and of such as were, according to Josephus, accused of a breach of the laws concerning food and the keeping of the Sabbath; at all events, a certain intermingling of the Jewish and Samaritan races took place at this time. The Mosaic law was now adopted by the Samaritans, who on that very account became all the more the rivals of the Jews, and were consequently the more detested by them; comp. *e.g.* the passage, Wisd. l. 25 sq. (27 sq.) (7). Prophecy was in Nehemiah's days in a state of deep declension. When Nehemiah was accused by Sanballat of having appointed prophets to proclaim him king, he retorted by accusing Sanballat of having hired the prophet Shemaiah to put him in fear, on which occasion other prophets and a prophetess Noadiah are also mentioned (Neh. vi. 6–14). In his days, however, that is, in the time of his second governorship, the last of the canonical prophets of the Old Testament exercised his ministry. His book, the last of the minor prophets, is known as that of מַלְאָכִי, a name which should perhaps be understood appellatively. From the Book of Malachi we learn that an external legalism, which subsequently developed into Pharisaism, had now taken

Digitized by Google

possession of the masses. Malachi contends against a dead self-righteousness, which was contented with the most superficial fulfilment of the law (Mal. i. 6 sqq., iii. 7 sqq.), and announces to the people who, discontented with the uneventful course of the day of small things, were desiring the judgments of God upon the heathen world and the appearance of the times of deliverance (ii. 17, iii. 13 sqq.), that the days of Messianic redemption would certainly appear, but would be preceded by a heavy and sifting judgment of the covenant people themselves (iii. 1 sqq., 19, 23 sq., iv. 1, 5 sq.) (8). With the promise of the Divine messenger, who was in the power of Elijah to prepare the way for the Lord who was coming to His temple (iii. 1, 23), the prophecies of the Old Testament conclude (9). For even the times of the Maccabees, when a prophet was expected, were unable, in spite of the heroic enthusiasm then displayed, to produce one (comp. such passages as 1 Macc. iv. 46, ix. 27, xiv. 41). If in later days the gift of prophecy was claimed, as Josephus tells us, for individuals, viz. for Hyrcanus, *Ant.* xiii. 10. 7, for seers among the Essenes, xiii. 11. 2, and xv. 10. 5, nay, for himself, *Bell. jud.* iii. 8. 9, this is of no importance so far as the history of Prophetism is concerned On the other hand, prophecy shone forth once more in the appearance of that messenger announced by Malachi, whom Christ declared, Matt. xi. 11, the greatest yet born of woman, and who closed the times of the old covenant by pointing to the already risen Sun of Righteousness in the words, John iii. 30, "He must increase, but I must decrease" (10).

(1) Neh. v. 2: "We, our sons, and our daughters, are many: therefore we take up corn for them, that we may eat and live." Ver. 5: "Our flesh is as the flesh of our brethren, our children as their children; and, lo, we bring into bondage our sons and our daughters to be servants, . . .: neither is it in our power to redeem them, for other men have our lands and vineyards."

(2) The post-Babylonian priests dwelt for the most part at Jerusalem. According to the lists, 1 Chron. ix. 10–13, which

Digitized by Google

are probably to be referred to the later date of Nehemiah (comp. Neh. xi. 10–14; and see on the relation of the two editions to each other, Bertheau's *Commentary on Chronicles*), six heads of priestly houses and their respective members dwelt at Jerusalem. It seems, from Ezra ii. 70 and Neh. vii. 73, that the old cities of the priests were also sought out. Neh. x. 35 sqq. shows that the revenues of the priests were under Nehemiah established according to the law, and xii. 44 that the offices required for their administration were also appointed. The number of Levites was considerably augmented in the times of Nehemiah,—284 of the first two classes, and 172 doorkeepers then dwelling at Jerusalem. The rest were settled in the provincial towns, especially in the Benjamite district; see Neh. xi. 15–24, xii. 27–29. The old cities of the Levites are no longer mentioned.

(3) The repeated formal engagements undertaken upon oath by the people in honour of Jehovah, are among the peculiarities of Israelite history. The first transaction of the kind took place under Moses, another after the overthrow of Athaliah, another under Josiah, and one such is here related.

(4) In fact, matters had gone so far, that the continuance of an Israelite nationality, maintaining its contrast to heathenism, was seriously imperilled, the strong party among the Jews which was hostile to Nehemiah being apparently determined to obliterate this contrast.

(5) Hence (see Neh. xiii. 28 sq., and from Ezra x. 18–22) it is evident that the priests especially were subjected to the severe discipline exercised by Ezra and Nehemiah with respect to mixed marriages. Such discipline was the more needful in proportion as the needy condition of the colony affected the state of public worship, and begot indifference and discouragement among the priesthood; see Mal. i. 6, ii. 9.

(6) That is certainly the most improbable view which makes the same thing take place twice, as is done by Petermann (article *Samaria* in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* xiii. p. 367), who, regarding the accounts of Nehemiah and Josephus as relating to different persons, accepts two Sanballats and two sons-in-law to Jewish high priests.

(7) Ecclus. l. 25 sq.: "There be two manner of nations which my soul abhorreth, and the third is no nation; they that

Digitized by Google

sit upon the mountain of Samaria, and that dwell among the Philistines, and that foolish people that dwell at Sichem." The third is the people dwelling at Sichem, *i.e.* these very Samaritans.

(8) The lecture-like form of Malachi recalls, in the manner and way in which it lays down propositions, raises questions in opposition, and then fully answers them, the dialogistic method of the school, as Ewald has aptly remarked.

(9) *Jewish apocalyptic literature* is an after-growth of prophecy. It bears the character of a secret literature, and undoubtedly originated in those narrower circles (probably among the Essenes, Joseph. *Bell. jud.* ii. 8. 12) in which the hopes of Israel were kept alive during the prophetless times by the study of the prophetic word. In such circles the predictions of Daniel, which, Dan. viii. 26, xii. 4, decidedly refer to secret tradition, would also be disseminated, while this book, on the other hand, seems not to have been made public till the times of the Maccabees, and then to have received its last form. (The origin of the said predictions in general cannot, however, be comprehended by recurring to the time of the Maccabees; comp. the article *Kanon* in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* vii. p. 420.) This apocalyptic literature, whose monuments are the Book of Enoch, the Jewish Sibyllines, the Fourth Book of Ezra, the Psalter of Solomon, aims at constructing a course of history in the light of the prophetic word, in which attempt it fastens especially on symbolic numbers. Such apocalyptic literature is, however, the product of reflection; and no prophet, properly so called, is known by Judaism after Malachi; comp. on this subject the article *Messias* in Herzog, ix. p. 426 sqq.

(10) It is a remarkable phenomenon, that as, before the Chaldean destruction of Jerusalem, false prophecy was at its height, and bore a great share of the guilt of that terrible catastrophe; so also, in the dreadful days preceding the Roman conquest of Jerusalem, a number of false prophets again appeared, by whose worthless predictions the people were involved in ruin (Josephus, *Bell. jud.* vi. 5. 2 sq.), while the genuine word of prophecy was despised.

Digitized by Google

§ 193.

The Beginning of Sopherism. Public Worship at the Close of this Period.

As, in that time of expectation which is devoid of revelation from on high, we are referred to the written revelation, and above all to the written law, the scribes or Sopherim, who diligently applied themselves to the records of revelation, and especially to the exposition, completion, and fencing of the law, now appear in the place of the prophets. Their prototype and representative is Ezra (comp. Ezra vii. 6, 10), for which reason subsequent tradition refers to him whatever the united agency of the scribes effected (1). The Sopherim originally sprang from the priesthood, the scribe Ezra being also a priest. The exposition of the law was indeed part of the priestly office (see Mal. ii. 7, comp. § 95), and in Hag. ii. 11 sqq. it is the priests who are referred to for a decision in questions concerning the law. It is possible that in pre-Babylonian times individual priests, specially skilled in the law, exercised this branch of their calling, and were called the תֹּמְכֵי הַתּוֹרָה, Jer. ii. 8, and also סֹפְרִים, viii. 8. But it was not till after Ezra that the scribes (the γραμματεῖς of the New Testament) formed a separate class, which, though both priests and Levites belonged to it, was by no means restricted to men of Levitical descent (2). Thus an essential portion of the priestly office was lost, and indeed that portion in which was henceforth concentrated the spiritual agency and religious interest of Judaism. The priests, as such, were now restricted to the performance of religious rites and the transactions therewith connected. Now, however, that worship upon Mount Zion, of which the son of Sirach spoke so enthusiastically, Ecclus. l. 5–23, was without its former pledges of God's abiding presence in the midst of His people, and the temple had but an empty Holy of Holies. The prediction Jer. iii. 16 sq. was fulfilled as to its negative side,

Digitized by Google

"They shall no more make the ark of the covenant," though not as to its positive side, "They shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord, and all nations shall be gathered unto it," etc. The breastplate also of the high priest was without the Urim and Thummim, whose restoration was waited for, Ezra ii. 63, § 97, but in vain. Thus, the ancient means by which the priesthood had been divinely endowed for its office having disappeared, the priests lost their consciousness of their mediatorial position between God and the people. They formed only a hierarchical class, which, being no longer restrained by the presence of the two other theocratic offices, was but the more inclined to traffic with its prerogatives in the interest of secular and political aims (3). By the side of those services of the temple which were connected with the priesthood, was more and more developed the service of the *synagogue*, with the reading and exposition of the law,—a service whose administration devolved upon the scribes. This now formed the actual centre of the religious life of Judaism. By means of the synagogues, a different view of religious worship in general was formed, animal sacrifices declined, and their place was occupied by the sacrifice of prayer, the contemplation of the Divine word forming the central point of the service. It is chiefly with the synagogue and not with the temple that Christian worship is connected (4).

(1) Further particulars, especially concerning the Great Synagogue, belong to the Introduction to the Old Testament. We can here give only the following:—Ezra must already have taken the precaution of instructing for his purposes a number of individuals learned in the law (comp. Ezra vii. 25, Neh. viii. 7 sq., 13). Tradition assigns to him a college of scribes, under the name of *the Great Synagogue*, as sharers in his work of organization. The historical books of the Old Testament know nothing of such an authority, for it can be found neither in the committee of elders appointed, according to Ezra x. 16, for the putting away of the foreign wives, nor in that appointed, Neh. x. 1 sqq., to seal the covenant of the people to keep the

Digitized by Google

law. The historical germ in this tradition probably amounts to no more than this, that in it is embodied the remembrance of the succession and co-operation of the scribes, from the times of Ezra to those of Simon the Just (about 300 B.C.). Whether these scribes, however, exercised their functions as an organized court, or only as a voluntary association, and in virtue of their personal authority, cannot be determined. Comp. the article *Kanon* in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* vii. p. 245 sqq.

(2) It is disputed whether any scribe of the date of Ezra is known to us even by name besides himself. This depends upon how we understand Neh. xiii. 13. Zadok the scribe, who may, however, be also regarded (so Bertheau) as merely a writer who had to make the catalogue for the store-chambers of the temple, is there distinguished from both priests and Levites; if, however, he were the individual mentioned iii. 29, he must have been a priest.

(3) Comp. on this subject Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, i. p. 148. For further particulars on the high-priesthood, priesthood, and Levites, see the articles on these subjects in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* viii. p. 358.

(4) On the further history of Judaism, see the article *Volk Gottes* in Herzog, xviii. p. 278.

Digitized by Google

SECOND SECTION

THE THEOLOGY OF PROPHETISM.

§ 194.

Summary.

The theology of Mosaism is further developed by prophecy, especially in the following respects:—

1. With regard to the doctrine of *God and of His relation to the world*, the idea of Jehovah developes into the Divine name of THE LORD OF HOSTS (*Jehovah Zebaoth*), with which is connected a further expansion of *angelology*.

2. In its conflict both with the legal externalism and apostasy of the people, the intrinsically moral nature of the law is further developed by Prophecy, and greater profundity thus given to that view of *man's religious and moral relation* to God which Mosaism involves; in other words, the doctrine of *sin and of righteousness* is further unfolded.

3. *The communion of man with God* culminates in Prophecy. *The nature of prophetic revelation and of prophecy* will be here represented as the continuation of what Mosaism teaches concerning the *forms of Divine revelation*.

4. The progress of *the kingdom of God* forms the essential matter of prophecy.

FIRST DIVISION.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD OF HOSTS (1) AND OF ANGELS.

§ 195.

Form and Occurrence of the Name of God. Partial Views concerning its Original Meaning.

JEHOVAH ZEBAOTH.—The full expression of this name of God is יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת (or יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַצְּבָאוֹת); it is, however, mostly

Digitized by Google

found in its abbreviated form, יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת (once, Amos ix. 5, יְהוָה הַצְּבָאוֹת). In the latter mode of expression, יְהוָה is not in the *status constructus* (2), against which the form אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת already occurring in certain passages in the Psalms also speaks (3); but the abbreviated form must be explained by an ellipsis, the more general notion being taken from the *nomen proprium*, as in גַּת פְּלִשְׁתִּים and similar combinations (4). צְבָאוֹת never appears alone as a name of God in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. The LXX. are the first to treat the word occasionally as a proper name, viz. by generally rendering it in the First Book of Samuel and in Isaiah by *σαβαώθ* (5); while, on the other hand, they replace it in the Second Book of Samuel, frequently in Jeremiah and throughout the minor prophets, with the exception of Zech. xiii. 2, by *παντοκράτωρ*, and in the Psalms, occasionally in Jeremiah, and in some passages in other books, by *κύριος* or *θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων* (6). Jehovah Zebaoth does not occur as the Divine name in the Pentateuch, Joshua, or Judges. It is first mentioned in the narrative of the times of Eli. Sacrifices are offered in Shiloh to Jehovah Zebaoth (1 Sam. i. 3, comp. with iv. 4); and it is by this name that Hannah invokes God (i. 11). The name seems to have been customary chiefly in the days of Samuel and David (comp. 1 Sam. xv. 2, xvii. 45; 2 Sam. vii. 8, 26 sq.; Ps. xxiv. 10). In the Books of the Kings it seldom occurs, and only in the mouths of prophets, especially of Eli. In the prophetical books it is most frequently found in Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi (7).

This name, according to its original meaning, is said by many (8) to designate Jehovah as the *God of battles* of His people, who are called, Ex. vii. 4 and xii. 41, the "armies" of the Lord. The expression "God of armies" would thus be equivalent with the appellation אֱלֹהֵי מַעַרְכוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל (God of the armies of Israel). Ps. xxiv. is also referred to, where יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת in ver. 10 is said to be equivalent with יְהוָה גִּבּוֹר מִלְחָמָה in ver. 8.

Digitized by Google

But though it is true, as will be shortly seen, that there is in this name a reference to the fact that God manifests Himself in irresistible power against the enemies of His people, yet if this were its original meaning, it would be strange that the name should not yet have made its appearance in those ancient times which were expressly the times of the great theocratic conflicts ("the wars of Jehovah," Num. xxi. 14); and again, that it did not originate, but was already in use, in the warlike age of David. The combination in 1 Sam. xvii. 45, of "the Lord of Hosts" and "the God of the armies of Israel," testifies that the two names do not signify the same thing. A higher notion must be involved in the former, namely this, that the fact that the God of the armies of Israel is also the Lord of Hosts makes Him so terrible a God. A similar relation exists in Ps. xxiv. between vers. 8 and 10. From the Lord mighty in battle, the psalm rises to the God of Hosts; the thought in the tenth verse corresponding with that in the first: so that the ode celebrates the God of Israel as God of the world both in its opening and conclusion. This more general meaning of the name is maintained by a second view, which, referring to Gen. ii. 1, understands the expression צְבָאוֹת as applying to the *creatures in general*, who in their entirety compose the great army of the Lord. Thus it is the general sovereignty of God, as effectively manifested in all creation, of which He alone has the disposal, which is impressed upon this name (9). But the expression "host" is only figuratively applied to the creatures in general, the mention of the heavens being in the passage appealed to the immediate occasion of the introduction of צְבָאָם, which only stands for the creatures of the earth also, in virtue of a zeugma, as the more exact expression Neh. ix. 6 shows (10). The explanation of the name must be derived from the *heavenly host* (צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם).

(1) Compare my article *Zebaoth* in Herzog's *Realencykl.* xviii. p. 400 sqq.

Digitized by Google

(2) So Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache*, p. 268; Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, iii. p. 1146.

(3) See Ps. lix. 6, lxxx. 5, 8, xv. 20, lxxxiv. 9. The Masoretes, too, in the passages where אֲדֹנָי precedes יהוה, have never placed under the former word the points of אֱלֹהִי, but always those of אֱלֹהִים (comp. also Isa. x. 16, אֲדֹנָי צְבָאוֹת).

(4) See Hengstenberg, *Christologie des A. T.* ii. sec. 1, p. 436 sqq.

(5) Also Jas. v. 4. The expression *σαβαώθ* is, however, never found alone in the LXX.; it first stands thus in the *Sibyllines*, i. 304, and elsewhere. Lydus, *de mensibus*, § 38, 98, regards the name as a Phœnician one, and derives from it the number seven: *ὁ ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἑπτὰ πόλους, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὁ δημιουργός*.

(6) The other Greek versions have the more exact expression *κύριος στρατιῶν*.

(7) It is found in other prophets also, at least in single passages, but never in either Ezekiel or Daniel. It is also wanting in the monuments of the Khochmah; while, on the other hand, it sometimes appears in the Psalms, but only in the first three books, and consequently seems to have been out of use in more recent psalmody. Among the post-Babylonian historical books, it is found only in Chronicles, and there only in the history of David (1 Chron. xi. 9, xvii. 7, 24).

(8) So Herder, *Geist der hebr. Poesie, Werke zur Relig. und Theol.* ii. p. 167 sq.; v. Cölln, *Theol. des A. T.* p. 104. ("This combination of the name of God is first found in the Books of Samuel, where it is pretty frequently used, but always with reference to war, battles, and victories; so that the word *hosts* must be taken from the hosts of the Israelites, and this name of God understood to designate Him as the God of warlike hosts, the God who presides over the hosts of Israel and leads them to victory.") {Schrader, in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.* i. 319, argues that the *usus loquendi* of the plural צבאות is conclusive for this view.}

(9) So Hävernick, *Theol. des A. T.* sec. 1, p. 41 sq., sec. 2, p. 48. This view is undoubtedly correct, in rightly recognising the fact that the almighty power of God over the universe is implied in the name, though this is not the idea which originally gave rise to it. Joh. Buxtorf (the younger), also, in his

Digitized by Google

treatise, *de nominibus Dei hebraicis* (*Dissertat. philol. theol.* p. 280), understands by the hosts of God *varios exercitus, qui ipsi parent, ministrant et militant*, the celestial hosts, viz. the angels and stars; the terrestrial, the powers of nature, sword, famine, pestilence, etc.; and lastly, the hosts of Israel.

(10) Neh. ix. 6: "Thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and Thou preservest them all; and the host of heaven worshippeth Thee."

§ 196.

The Host of Heaven: 1. *The Heavenly Bodies.*

The host of heaven in the Old Testament includes, as the above-cited passage of Nehemiah shows, the heavenly bodies and the *celestial spirits.*

In the view of the nations bordering upon Israel, the heavenly bodies were either Divine powers, genii pursuing their paths clothed in ethereal bodies, or at least the shades or the visible forms of Divine beings. In opposition to such notions, which essentially unite if they do not identify the heavenly bodies and heavenly spirits, the Old Testament distinctly maintains not only the creaturehood of the heavenly hosts (Ps. xxxiii. 6), but also their distinction into the two above-named classes. It is only by a poetical personification that the stars are spoken of in the song of Deborah, Judg. v. 20, as the warriors of the Lord, who, leaving their courses, descend to fight for Israel against Sisera; as the morning stars, said in Job xxxviii. 7 to have joined with the angels in celebrating the morning of creation, just as in ix. 13, xxvi. 13 (according to the most probable interpretation of these passages), a poetical application is made of mythological notions of a restraining of sidereal powers (1). The greater the danger to the Israelites, surrounded as they were by Sabæanism, of being seduced into a worship of the heavenly bodies,—and it may be seen how seductive the appearance of the sun and moon was considered,

Digitized by Google

xxxi. 26 (2),—the more important was it not only to declare Jehovah's superiority to the heavenly bodies, and to forbid their adoration, but also to maintain such a view concerning them as might of itself put an end to the worship of them. This is accordingly done from Gen. i. 14 onwards. The heavenly bodies are declared to be merely light-bearers (מְאוֹרֹת), created by God, and as such subserving earthly purposes (comp. Ps. civ. 19 sqq.). They manifest, indeed, by their motions and splendour, the power and wisdom of the Creator (Ps. viii. 4, xix. 5, Amos v. 8, Job ix. 9, xxxviii. 31 sq.), but their brilliancy admits of no comparison with the Divine glory, xxv. 5. Thus they are the hosts of God whom His almighty will commands (Isa. xl. 26 (3), xlv. 12); they serve to proclaim and to dignify the manifestations of His judgments (Joel iii. 15, Isa. xiii. 10, Hab. iii. 11; comp. the poetical passage, Josh. x. 12 sq.). Their creaturehood is shown by the fact that they as well as the terrestrial creation are transitory (Isa. xxxiv. 4, comp. with li. 6, Ps. cii. 26 sq.). Isa. xxiv. 23 shows that the supereminence of God above the heavenly bodies, in opposition to the worship of them, is expressed by the name Jehovah Zebaoth. This passage is not to be understood as simply parallel with lx. 19, but as also involving the notion that the last judgment, by means of which the Lord will set up His kingdom upon earth, will manifest the vanity of heathenism with its worship of the heavenly bodies, and the honour it has rendered to them as the tutelary powers of kingdoms. It is possible that this element in the idea of the Jehovah Zebaoth, being in a chronological point of view primary (so Vatke), the name may have come into use in the time of the Judges, chiefly as a counterpoise to the worship of the host of heaven. But it is more natural to seek the root of the name in the designation of the angel of the Lord as the "Captain of the host," Josh. v. 14 sq., the chief significance of the appellation being certainly contained in its reference to the host of the heavenly *spirits*.

(1) That no embodiment of the stars is intended in the

Digitized by Google

passages cited, is evident from the whole teaching of the Old Testament.

(2) Job xxxi. 26 sq.: "If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness; and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand."

(3) Isa. xl. 26 describes how God each night calls forth and musters His starry host.

§ 197.

2. *The Host of the Heavenly Spirits.*

The Old Testament speaks of the host of heavenly spirits, the armies of the Son of God, the angels, in a *threefold aspect* (1). *First*, they form that *higher church* which, standing at the head of the choir of the universe (Ps. cxlviii. 2, cl. 1), adores God in the heavenly sanctuary. It has already been remarked, when treating of the doctrine of the Shekinah (vol. i. § 62), that the indwelling of God in the earthly sanctuary corresponds with the presence of God in the heavenly sanctuary, which, like the former, bears the name of הֵיכָל (used for the first time in the Davidic Psalms), Ps. xi. 4 (2). From this central point of the Divine glory, proceed all God's manifestations of mercy and judgment to the world (Mic. i. 2 sq., Hab. ii. 20, Zech. ii. 17; hence the prayer, Isa. lxiii. 15) (3). This is the sphere of the adoring higher church (4) of the sons of God, בְּנֵי אֵלִים; comp. Ps. xxix. 1, 9 (5), but especially lxxxix. 6–8, where the sons of God are called the congregation of the saints, קְהַל קְדֹשִׁים, who are constantly praising the wonders of Divine grace, with reference in this passage to His Divine counsel in the choice of the house of David. Their near relation to God is shown ver. 7, where they are designated סוֹד קְדֹשִׁים (the council of the saints). When, then, it is said in this passage, "God is greatly to be feared in the council of His saints, and to be had in reverence of all them that are about Him; O Lord God of *Hosts*, who is like unto Thee?" the reference of this name

Digitized by Google

of God to the angelic host is unmistakeable. The heavenly hosts do not appear as an assembly of heavenly councillors properly so called—a divan, as some have represented the matter —either here or in the vision of the heavenly assize, Dan. vii. 9 sqq. (6). The meaning of this passage is rather, that the heavenly hosts, as the appointed instruments of executing God's judgments, are also to be the witnesses of His counsels (7). So, too, are the heavenly host seen, 1 Kings xxii. 19 sqq., Job i. sq., assembled around the Lord, not that He may take counsel with them, but that they may announce to Him their execution of His behests (comp. Zech. i. 8 sqq., concerning the celestial horsemen who walk to and fro through the earth), and receive His further commands. *Secondly*—and this is the point of view in which the heavenly hosts are chiefly represented—they are the *messengers of God* (מַלְאָכִים), the instruments of executing His will in mercy and judgment for the deliverance of His people and the subjugation of His enemies; see Ps. ciii. 20 sq., cxlviii. 2. This implies that God's government is carried on by the means of personal and living powers. Divine providence is, generally speaking, a living activity, everywhere present, seeing and knowing all things (8); hence it is symbolically designated, Zech. iv. 10 (comp. Ps. cxxxix. 7), as the seven eyes of God which run to and fro throughout the whole earth. All the powers and elements of nature subserve this providence, as it is expressed (according to the probable construction) in Ps. civ. 4: "He makes the winds His messengers, the flames of fire His servants" (comp. § 61, note 4). For the purposes of His kingdom and the special service of His people, however, He has chosen the heavenly spirits, who are the companions of man; comp. as chief passages, *e.g.* xci. 11, xxxiv 8 (9). But here, too, the heavenly hosts are represented as a Divine *army;* in Gen. xxxii. 2, a camp of God (מַחֲנֵה) being already spoken of as surrounding and protecting Jacob, with which comp. 2 Kings vi. 16, Josh. v. 14 sq. (10). With regard to the employment of the heavenly host as the messen-

Digitized by Google

gers of God, the following passages should be observed: in Zech. iii. 7, it is said to Joshua the high priest, that God will give him a leader from among the angels that stand before him; comp. also Job v. 1 (11). Specially important also is the passage in the speech of Elihu, xxxiii. 23. We do not quote this passage, as many do, in support of the doctrine of degrees of angels. The מַלְאָךְ מֵלִיץ, *angelus interpres*, אֶחָד מִנִּי־אָלֶף is not the angel of unparalleled dignity raised above a thousand others,—the angel of the covenant (as many, including Schlottman and Delitzsch, understand),—but an angel out of the thousand, *i.e.* such an one as God has a thousand of, מֵלִיץ here signifying not his representation of man before God, but that he is the interpreter of God's will to man. He is sent by God to show to fallen man his uprightness, *i.e.* to lead him to repentance and sincere confession of sin, that so he may, according to ver. 24, find favour with God. In opposition to Satan, whose occupation it is to ruin men, Job i., God has thousands of angels whose business it is to be active in the deliverance of human souls. *Thirdly*, the hosts of heavenly spirits are also appointed to be *His attendant witnesses*, and *partially His instruments when He appears in His royal and judicial glory*. This is already alluded to, Deut. xxxiii. 2 (12), the sense of the passage naturally being, not that the angelic host remained in heaven, but that they were witnesses of those revelations in which they themselves took an active part, the Lord appearing as lawgiver in the midst of His heavenly host. Comp. Ps. lxviii. 17, where God is represented as seated upon His throne on Zion, surrounded by the chariots or cavalry of the angelic hosts. The expression רֶכֶב אֱלֹהִים, here used, places the latter in the light of a heavenly band of warriors whom God is leading to battle against His enemies, and for the protection of His people. The connection of the name Jehovah Zebaoth with this notion is shown especially by Isa. xxxi. 4 (13); and hence it is plain in what sense this name is to be regarded as designating Jehovah as the God of battles. *Lastly*, the

Digitized by Google

heavenly host form Jehovah's retinue at the *last manifestation of His judgments*. The heavenly hosts are the heroes whom, according to Joel iii. 11, He leads down into the valley of Jehoshaphat; they are the saints with whom, according to Zech. xiv. 5, He appears upon the Mount of Olives in the crisis of the last conflict of the covenant people. Compare the description of the procession of the heavenly στρατεύματα, Rev. xix. 14.

(1) The two last expressions have already been discussed in vol. i. § 61.

(2) Ps. xi. 4: "The Lord is in His holy temple, the Lord's throne is in heaven."

(3) Mic. i. 2: "The Lord from His holy temple; . . . the Lord cometh forth out of His place." Hab. ii. 20: "The Lord is in His holy temple: let all the world keep silence before Him." Zech. ii. 13: "Be silent, O all flesh, before the Lord: for He rises up out of His holy habitation." Isa. lxiii. 15: "Look down from heaven, and behold from the habitation of Thy holiness and Thy glory."

(4) What was already said Isa. vi. of the adoring seraphim, on which see § 199, may be here referred to.

(5) Ps. xxix. 1: The angels are called *sons of God* (comp. § 61, note 2), who give to the Lord glory and strength; it is of them that it is said, ver. 5, that while the voice of the Lord goes forth in the storm over the whole earth, "in His temple all speak of His honour."

(6) In Dan. vii. 9 sqq., the Eternal Judge, the Ancient of Days, appears surrounded by a ministering host of a thousand thousands and ten thousand times ten thousand.

(7) Dan. iv. 17, indeed, differs in this respect. But here Nebuchadnezzar, when he speaks of a "decree of the (heavenly) watchers" and "the word of the holy ones," is giving utterance to a purely heathen notion, for which Dan. v. 21 afterwards substitutes the correct expression, "decree of the Most High."

(8) See the description of the cherubim, § 119.

(9) Ps. xci. 11: "The Lord gives His angels charge of the pious man, to keep him in all his ways." And xxxiv. 7: "The angel of the Lord encamps round about them that fear Him."

Digitized by Google

(10) 2 Kings vi. 16 sq. Elisha knows he is surrounded by bands of protecting angels, whom he prays that his servant may also behold.

(11) In Job v. 1, the same notion of the assistance of the angels, the קְדֹשִׁים, in heaven is alluded to.

(12) In the description of the theophany in Deut. xxxiii. 2, it is said: "The Lord came from (A. V. with) ten thousands of saints."

(13) Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iii. § 2, p. 81, § 3, p. 87, relies chiefly upon the passage cited, and is inclined to regard that meaning of the name which makes it designate God as Him who comes with all His heavenly hosts to help the armies of Israel, as the original one. He considers, also, that the name took its rise when once the army of Israel, strengthened by the hosts of the Lord descending from heaven for their help, put their enemies to flight. The passage is certainly a chief passage, but still only *a* chief passage.

§ 198.

Result with respect to the Name Jehovah Zebaoth.

In summing up what has been said, we find that the significance of the doctrine of Jehovah Zeboath consists in the fact that it teaches us to recognise not only the supermundane power and glory of the living God, but also makes Him known to us as interposing, according to His free and sovereign will, in the affairs of the world, and therefore not bound to the elements or forces of nature which obey Him; but as having, on the contrary, not only these but also the spiritual powers of the heavenly world at His disposal for the execution of His behests. Hence this name not only expresses the contrast between Himself and a deification of the heavenly bodies, but also the general contrast between Himself and those heathen deities who are absorbed in nature and the world. Thus the contemplation of the Lord of the heavenly hosts is expanded to that of *the Omnipotent Ruler of the Universe.* So (according to what was remarked, § 195) Ps. xxiv. 10; Isa. vi. 3, li. 15, liv. 5 (1);

Digitized by Google

Amos ix. 5, etc. The chief passage, however, in this respect is Jer. x. 16 in its connection with vers. 1–10. The name, however, as more nearly defining the idea of Jehovah (comp. what is said on this subject, § 41), refers pre-eminently to the *regal acts* of God, especially so far as these concern His battles, victories, and other manifestations of Divine sovereignty for the protection of His covenant people in opposition to a world which strives against them, as is proved by numerous passages in the Psalms and prophets; comp. besides those above cited, Ps. xlvi. 8, 12, lxxx. 8, 15. The absence of the name from the monuments of the Khochmah is explained by the circumstance that these do not relate to the revelation of the kingdom of God; while its absence from the Pentateuch is accounted for by the inconsiderable part played by the heavenly hosts in comparison with the angel of the Lord (§ 61). The element of Divine *transcendency* latent in the name, is subsequently embodied in the Divine appellation, "the God of heaven," which occurs Dan. ii. 37, 44, and in certain passages of the Books of Esther and Nehemiah.

(1) In Isa. liv. 5, "The God of the whole earth shall He be called," corresponds with "The Lord of hosts is His name."

§ 199.

Angels of Higher Order and Special Office.

The later prophetical books speak of angels of higher order and special calling among the heavenly host. The cherubim, of whom we treated in vol. i. (§ 199), and remarked that they never appear as ministering spirits, are not among these. The seraphim, too (Isa. vi.), have already, as merely symbolical appearances, been comprised with the cherubim, with whom the description given Rev. iv. 8 of the characteristics of living creatures (ζῶα) also identifies them. Thus *e.g.* Hävernick

Digitized by Google

(*Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 1st ed. p. 80, 2d ed. p. 95) regards the seraphim, who represent the ideal creation under the form of light or fire, as a modification of the cherubim. But in the chapter in question (Isa. vi.) the only passage in which they occur, ver. 6, rather suggests the ministry of angels; though seraphim here cannot be said entirely to correspond with the *angelus interpres* in Zechariah and Daniel, for they do not interpose as organs of revelation between Jehovah and the prophet, who in ver. 8 is conscious that the Divine call is a direct one. The *symbolism of their appearance* is very simple. With two wings they cover their faces,—to express that even the most exalted spirits cannot bear the full vision of the Divine glory; with two they cover their feet,—to symbolize their reverence; with two they fly,—to express the swiftness with which they execute the Divine commands. In other respects they are evidently represented in human form; for faces, hands, and feet are spoken of. There is not a trace of the serpent form; and the combination of the name by which they are called with that of the poisonous kind of serpent called שָׂרָף is inadmissible, if only because it is impossible, according to the Old Testament view, to make the serpent a symbol of anything sacred (1). The derivation of the name from the root שָׂרַף, to burn, would seem favoured by the particular recorded ver. 7, where the seraph, as the divinely-appointed instrument for the expiation and purification of the prophet's mouth, appears with celestial fire, but that the meaning of the verbal root is active, to consume by fire (not to glow with heat, or anything similar). Hence the tracing of the word, as by many earlier writers, especially Steudel, *Theologie des A. T.* p. 225, to the Arabic root شَرُفَ, *nobilis fuit*, whence comes شَرِيفٌ, noble, is still, to say the least, equally permissible (2). According to this derivation, the seraphim would be thus designated as being the most exalted among celestial spirits, and might be regarded as the angelic princes, שָׂרִים, subsequently mentioned in the Book of

Digitized by Google

Daniel, though the name would also correspond to the designation of angels in general, as אַבִּירִים, Ps. lxxviii. 25, and גִּבֹּרֵי כֹחַ, Ps. ciii. 20 (3). The *seven angels* mentioned in Ezek. ix. as sent forth to execute the Divine sentence of extermination upon idolatrous Jerusalem, next come under consideration. The passage, indeed, by no means implies that there is a band of seven angels whose special vocation it is to be the watchmen and guardians of Jerusalem. For the *number seven* is here, as elsewhere in the Old Testament, the sign that a Divine operation is being completed, viz. in this passage the Divine judgment now advancing to its close, and there is no necessity for having recourse to the seven planet gods of the Babylonians (comp. Diodor. *Biblioth.* ii. 30) and the seven Amshaspands of the Persians. This heathen notion might rather be regarded as the foundation for the passage Job xii. 15 concerning the seven holy angels: *οἱ προσαναφέρουσι τὰς προσευχὰς τῶν ἁγίων καὶ εἰσπορεύονται ἐνώπιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ ἁγίου,* though this might also be founded on this vision of Ezekiel. It is, however, significant that in Ezekiel a seventh angel, distinguished by his high-priestly robe of linen, whose office it is to set a mark upon those who are to be delivered from the judgment about to be inflicted, comes forward before the other six who are to execute this judgment. This angel of special dignity corresponds to the horseman who, in the vision of Zech. i. 8, stands among the myrtle trees which symbolize the covenant people, and is evidently the chief over those who run to and fro through the earth. To him they bring their report; and he, upon receiving it, intercedes with the Lord of Hosts for Jerusalem. He seems also to be identical with the angel of the Lord in ch. iii., before whom Satan stands to accuse Joshua. In i. 12 he is hypostatically distinguished from Jehovah, while he yet appears in the scene in ch. iii. as His representative, where the words spoken are now said to be the words of Jehovah, now of this angel,—thus recalling the Mal'ach of the Pentateuch (§ 59 sq.). His superior rank is especially evident when he is compared

Digitized by Google

with the הַמַּלְאָךְ הַדֹּבֵר בִּי, the *angelus interpres* of Zechariah, who interprets to this prophet the meaning of the visions vouchsafed to him, but who is never regarded as the representative of Jehovah. It is very remarkable that, as Baumgarten (*Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja*, i. p. 68) very justly observes, this angel, in whom is the name of Jehovah, withdraws from the history of revelation so long as Israel is under a visible ruler of the house of David; but now, when this visible rule is abrogated, an invisible ruler again appears, and attains a more concrete form, combined with personal agency, though at the same time hypostatically distinguished from God. In what has hitherto been said, the *names of the angels* have not yet been touched on: these, viz. מִיכָאֵל and גַּבְרִיאֵל, first appear in Daniel. To begin with the latter, גַּבְרִיאֵל, *i.e.* man of God, is said in the Book of Daniel to be the angel who explains the visions to Daniel, viii. 16, ix. 21, thus answering to the *angelus interpres* of Zechariah (4). It is, however, the מִיכָאֵל of the Book of Daniel who apparently corresponds to the angel of the Lord in Zechariah, the horseman among the myrtle trees, who advocates the cause of the covenant people. He is called, x. 13, "one of the chief princes" (אַחַד הַשָּׂרִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים); and xii. 1, "the great prince which standeth for the sons of thy people" (הַשַּׂר הַגָּדוֹל הָעֹמֵד עַל־בְּנֵי עַמֶּךָ); and in x. 21, briefly, "your prince" (שַׂרְכֶם). But nothing is said, at least in the Book of Daniel, of Michael being, like the ancient angel of the covenant (the bearer of the שֵׁם, of the Divine side of revelation), the descent of the Divine nature into the sphere of the creature. It is certainly true that later Jewish theology identified Michael with the shechinah (5), while among moderns Hengstenberg identifies him with the Logos. Even his name is said by the latter (*Die Offenbarung*, i. p. 611) to show that we should not seek for Michael in the region of the finite. The name, he says, signifies, Who is like me, who am God, in whom God's glory is manifested? מִיכָאֵל, however, actually appears, and that pretty frequently, in the Old Testament as the name of a man,

Digitized by Google

from Num. xiii. 13 to Ezra viii. 8. For the rest, this name of the prince of the angels does not imply chiefly (as Caspari, *Ueber Micha*, p. 15, insists) a humble acknowledgment of the Divine incomparableness on the part of the angel, but is an actual statement concerning the angel himself, and expresses the irresistibility of him to whom God gives the power to execute His behests (6). But another appearance in the Book of Daniel now claims our attention. According to ch. x., a man, called neither angel nor prince, but quite indefinitely אִישׁ־אֶחָד, appears to Daniel on the banks of the Tigris. This appearance, before which his human nature threatens to succumb, is, as already remarked note 4, not Gabriel. It is the same person who at Ulai, viii. 15–17, commands Gabriel to interpret to Daniel the vision he had received,—the same who, xii. 7, guarantees by a solemn oath the fulfilment of the Divine counsel. It is obvious that this appearance must be identified with him who, vii. 13 (comp. especially x. 16, 18), comes as a son of man in the clouds of heaven to receive dominion over all nations, *i.e.* the Messiah (see below), the description of the glorified Christ, Rev. i. 13–15, being also taken from Dan. x. 5 sqq. (7). We next meet in the Book of Daniel with the remarkable phenomenon that the ancient Mal'ach becomes, on the one hand, the angel Michael, who, though highly exalted among the angels, is still hypostatically distinct from Jehovah; while, on the other, One appears to whom Michael ministers assistance. That dominion over the earth should be given to this Being, is quite consistent with the description given in ch. x. This unnamed Being declares, ver. 13, that he has already contended with שַׂר מַלְכוּת פָּרָס, the prince of the kingdom of Persia, that Michael then came to help him, and that thus he remained the conqueror of the kings of Persia. In ver. 20 sq. he continues that he is about to depart again to fight with the שַׂר פָּרָס, the prince of Persia, that then the שַׂר־יָוָן, the prince of Greece, will also come, and that none will help him against these two except מִיכָאֵל שַׂרְכֶם, Michael your prince. It is quite erroneous

Digitized by Google

to suppose the princes of Persia and Greece to be earthly kings (Hävernick and others),—the שַׂר of Persia being in fact distinguished from the kings of Persia. They are angels in whom the power of Persia and Greece, which exalted itself against the kingdom of God and strove to frustrate His counsel, is personified; and whether they are regarded as tutelary powers or as representatives of the national spirit, is a matter of comparative indifference.—What has already been advanced will help to facilitate the explanation of the passage with which we shall close this subject, viz. Isa. xxiv. 21. In that day, says the prophet (in which the secular power shall be humbled), the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones on high (צְבָא הַמָּרוֹם בַּמָּרוֹם), and the kings of the earth upon the earth, and they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited (8). And first, the theory which regards the צְבָא הַמָּרוֹם as only the high and powerful ones of earth must be rejected, for בַּמָּרוֹם is evidently antithetical to עַל־הָאֲדָמָה. What is here spoken of is, on the contrary, a judgment in the invisible world corresponding to the judgment upon the mighty ones of earth. This judgment in the invisible world, viewed in the light cast upon it by the passage in Daniel, is a judgment inflicted upon the spiritual powers in heaven who represent and answer to the earthly powers. We find, then, already in the Old Testament, the doctrine further developed in the New, that the dispensations and judgments of God upon earth are closely connected with corresponding events in the higher world of spirits (9).

(1) The reference of the seraphim to the Egyptian Serapis has only the value of a mere fancy.

(2) So also Schultz, in *der alttest. Theol.* "*Fürsten.*"

(3) Hofmann (in his *Schriftbeweis*, i. sec. 1, p. 328, sec. 2, p. 376) regards the seraphim after this last manner. His identification of them, however, with the תַּרְפִּים is utterly improbable.

Digitized by Google

(4) On the other hand, Gabriel is not, as many expositors erroneously suppose, identical with the Being who appears x. 5 sqq. (of whom hereafter).

(5) Compare the passages in Meuschen, *N. T. ex Talmude illustratum*, p. 717 sqq., where Adonai, Michael, and Shechinah are considered identical. It is said, *e.g.*, that the three angels who visited Abraham were Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael, and that Michael is the same as Adonai.

(6) It is quite certain, notwithstanding all that Hengstenberg says, that in Jude, ver. 9, and Rev. xii. 7 sqq., Michael is not identified with the Son of God. See, in opposition to Hengstenberg, Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. p. 127 sqq.; *Schriftbeweis*, i. sec. 1, p. 295 sqq., sec. 2, p. 340 sqq.

(7) This view, which already occurs among older theologians, especially Chr. B. Michaelis (*Uberiores adnot. in Dan.* p. 372), is advocated among moderns, particularly by Schmieder (in von Gerlach's *Bibelwerk*), Hilgenfeld (*die jüdische Apokalyptik*, p. 47 sqq.), and Keil.

(8) It cannot be with certainty decided whether the meaning of the last word (פָּקַד, in Niph.) is: they shall be reserved for the final judgment, to which 2 Pet. ii. 4 and Jude 6 are parallel; or, they are shut up for a season and then liberated, which sense is favoured by the parallel expression in Isa. xxiii. 17.

(9) Post-canonical Jewish writings teach the doctrine of *tutelary spirits of whole nations*. The LXX. have imported this notion into Deut. xxxii. 8, where they translate ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ (Hebrew: לְמִסְפַּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) As seventy heathen nations were enumerated in the table of nations, so were there supposed to be seventy angels, one for each nation and language. Two more *names of angels* are mentioned in the Old Testament Apocrypha, viz. Raphael in the Book of Tobit (the name—God heals—referring to the contents of the book), and Uriel in the Fourth Book of Ezra. According to a rabbinical assertion, the names of angels *ascenderunt in manu Israelis ex Babylone;* and this may be correct, inasmuch as Babylonian notions seem to have exercised an influence upon the subsequent development of angelology, especially in the Apocrypha.

Digitized by Google

§ 200.

The Doctrine of Satan.

Among the angels, the sons of God (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, as they are called in the Book of Job) who appear before Jehovah, we meet, in certain passages of the Old Testament, viz. in the prologue to the Book of Job, in Chronicles, and Zechariah, with *an angel called* הַשָּׂטָן, *of crafty and hostile disposition towards the covenant people and all who fear God, seeking to deprive them of the favour of God, but only suffered to act as His instrument.* The word שָׂטָן is properly an appellative, meaning an enemy, an adversary: it is thus used, Num. xxii. 22, of the angel who obstructs the way of Balaam; and Ps. cix. 6, where Luther incorrectly translates Satan as a proper noun, as שׂוֹטֵן, ver. 29 of the same psalm, shows. To exhibit *the internal connection between the doctrine of Satan and the other doctrines of the Old Testament*, we begin with the two parallel passages, 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 and 1 Chron. xxi. 1. We are here told that David had conceived the proud, and therefore God-displeasing, notion of numbering the people (comp. § 165). This is thus expressed in the older record, 2 Sam.: "The wrath of God moved David (הֵסִית) to say, Go and number Israel." The more recent document (1 Chron.) says: "Satan stood up against Israel, and moved David." Thus that which is by the older record directly referred to Divine agency, viz. that external manifestation of an inward sin (here David's pride), which is necessary in order to judgment being inflicted upon it (comp. § 54. 2), is by the later account attributed to a hostile spirit, to whom God gives the power of using the guilty inclinations of man to cause him to fall. Here, then, we again meet with the same fact which we encountered in the doctrine of the angels, viz. that the later record brings into greater prominence those powers which are the instruments of the Divine providence. But even in the older account, that Divine causality which is active in human

Digitized by Google

sin is distinguished from the ordinary Divine agency; comp. the passage 1 Sam. xvi. 14–23, already briefly noticed in vol. i. § 65. When the Spirit of the Lord, רוּחַ יְהוָה, departed from Saul on account of his sin, an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him, רוּחַ־רָעָה מֵאֵת יְהוָה, which evil spirit is afterwards called, ver. 15, רוּחַ־אֱלֹהִים רָעָה, and more briefly, ver. 23, רוּחַ־אֱלֹהִים. Thus we find that a Divine agency, differing from the Divine life-giving principle active in the world, interposes in sin, and especially in the province of obduracy. Other passages also point to such potencies appointed by God to be the instruments of the Divine wrath. We are told, Isa. xix. 14, that God had mingled a רוּחַ עִוְעִים, a perverse spirit, in the heart of the Egyptians, which, as a matter of judgment, would render them capable of acting only in an erroneous manner. To such passages belong also those in which the wrath of God is spoken of as *a cup*, of which they are compelled to drink who have incurred His judgments; comp. as the chief passage, Ps. lxxv. 9; also Jer. xxv. 15 sqq., Isa. li. 17, Ps. lx. 5. The transition hence to the doctrine of Satan is made by the passage 1 Kings xxii. 19 sqq. Micaiah the prophet relates a vision to the kings Ahab and Jehoshaphat. He saw the Lord sitting upon His heavenly throne, and all the host of heaven standing on His right hand and on His left. The Lord asks who will persuade Ahab to undertake, for his ruin, *i.e.* that he may meet his death, a war against the Syrians. Then the spirit (הָרוּחַ, incorrectly translated "a spirit") comes forth from among the heavenly host, and says: I will persuade him. The Lord says: Wherewith? The spirit answers: I will be a רוּחַ שֶׁקֶר (a lying spirit) in the mouth of all his prophets. The Lord says: Thou shalt persuade him, and also prevail; go and do so. Here, then, that power which is instrumental in bringing about the Divine judgment hovers between personification and proper personal existence. The advance to the actual doctrine of Satan is not, however, made by merely representing the principle which tempts man to sin as *concrete personality*, but consists especially in the fact that Satan, though

Digitized by Google

absolutely dependent on the Divine will with regard to what he effects, still acts from *a disposition hostile to man.* This is already hinted, 1 Chron. xxi. 1, in the standing up of Satan against Israel, and still more prominently brought forward in the prologue to Job, ch. i. sqq. It is true that Satan there appears as still in the midst of the בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים; but he comes from a predatory excursion upon earth, which he has evidently undertaken from hostility to men (to act as a spy upon them). It is evident that, as far as he is concerned, he does not question Job's righteousness for the sake of affording an occasion for confirming it, which is the purpose of God's counsel, but because he hopes that Job's piety will not endure temptation, and that he will thus cease to be an object of Divine complacency. That he may bring calamity upon Job, the Lord allows Satan the free disposal not only of the elements,—the tempest, and the fire of heaven,—but also of human beings (the nomadic hordes), and at length he is permitted to smite him with a most terrible disease. But he is obliged to obtain from God the power of effecting all this; and the limit to the injury he is allowed to inflict is appointed by the will of God; comp. ii. 6. Of special significance, moreover, is *the position of Satan with respect to the covenant people.* This is shown with particular clearness in Zech. iii., while it is also briefly alluded to 1 Chron. xxi. The vision in Zechariah is as follows:—Joshua the high priest is standing in unclean garments before the angel of the Lord, and Satan is standing at his right hand to accuse him. The Lord repels with threats the accusations of Satan, acquits the high priest, and commands him, as a token of his acquittal, to put on clean festal garments. This passage has been by some expositors most erroneously referred to the slanders uttered against the people and Joshua at the Persian court; for how could an accusation to the Persian king be possibly represented by the prophet as being at the same time an accusation to the Lord? The high priest is the representative of the people (1). He is accused before the Lord, not on account of his own sins

Digitized by Google

as an individual, but in his capacity of high priest. His priestly garments are defiled. Satan affirms that for this sinful people there is no valid mediation before God; that Israel is rejected because there is no longer an atonement for them. The Lord will, however, have pity, according to ver. 2, on this brand plucked from the fire, the remnant of His people, and will not regard their sin. He therefore causes the high priest to be clothed in clean garments, thus acknowledging the validity of the high-priestly mediation, though with an intimation, ver. 8, that the day of grace is still future; that He by whom a perfect atonement for the people is to be effected (and that in one day) must first appear; and that this future Redeemer is the Servant of God, the Branch (Zemach), and therefore the Messiah. Thus the work of Satan is to question the forgiveness, the justification of the church, in which sense he is called, Rev. xii. 10, the accuser of our brethren. Hence he is here represented as the antithesis to the angel of the Lord, who, according to Zech. i. 12, like the high priest on earth, stands before the Lord to intercede for the people. With respect also to his agency among men, Satan, who desires (Job i.) to destroy the souls of men (see the particulars, § 197), forms a contrast to the מְלִיץ מַלְאָךְ, Job xxxiii. 23, whose occupation it is to excite men to repentance and confession of sin, that their souls may be rescued from destruction.

The allusion just made to the organic connection between the doctrine of Satan and other Old Testament doctrines, testifies decidedly against the theory which derives it from the Persian religion. Quite apart from the fact that in pre-Babylonian times, to which the Book of Job must absolutely be referred, the notion of Persian influence is inconceivable, the Satan of the Old Testament is devoid of essential characteristics which must be present to justify a comparison with Ahriman. The monism of the Old Testament utterly excludes the admission of a hostile principle opposed from the very first to Deity; nor does it know as yet of a kingdom of darkness over which

Digitized by Google

Satan presides with relative independence. The Satan of the Old Testament is not as yet the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου of the New Testament, which disclosed the βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ at the same time that it brought revelation to its completion. The New Testament doctrine of the κόσμος, and of its antagonism to the kingdom of God, finds its parallel in the conflict between the secular monarchies and Israel; but though (as we have seen in the preceding section) this conflict is in Dan. x. and Isa. xxiv. connected with occurrences in the world of spirits, Satan does not appear upon the scene.

Of other evil angels nothing is distinctly taught in the Old Testament. By Azazel, Lev. xvi., we must probably understand, according to what was said, Part I. (§ 140), an evil spiritual power whom we may (with Hengstenberg) combine with the Satan of the later books, though the Old Testament itself will not furnish us with the middle terms necessary to prove the connection of the two.

It is true that the destroyers (מְמִתִים), who are in Job xxxiii. 22 contrasted with the מַלְאֲכֵי מֵלִין, must probably be referred not to fatal diseases, but to angels; this does not, however, imply that the Old Testament teaches the doctrine of a special class of angels of death, like the angel of death (Samael) of later Jewish theology. It is not the *nature* of these angels, but the *Divine commission*, which makes them destroyers. So also in Ps. lxxviii. 49, the מַלְאֲכֵי רָעִים are not evil angels, who would have been called מַלְאָכִים רָעִים, but *angeli malorum*, angels of evil, who ministered in the Egyptian plagues as the instruments of God, the collective conception of the מַשְׁחִית, who, according to Ex. xii. 13, 23, executes the last judgment upon the Egyptians, but who, as the מַלְאָךְ מַשְׁחִית, 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 1 Chron. xxi. 15, comp. Isa. xxxvii. 36, is the angel of the Lord (2). The spectral being לִילִית, Isa. xxxiv. 14, *i.e. nocturna*, regarded by the Talmudists a demon who specially lies in wait for children, and the שְׂעִירִים, xiii. 21, by whom goat-footed demons are usually understood, cannot of course be comprised

Digitized by Google

in the category of evil angels, apart from the fact that not a word is said in these passages concerning the real existence of such sprites (3).

(1) What was said, § 96, on the meaning of the high-priestly office may be here referred to.

(2) The saying of Ode (*De angelis*, p. 741), *Deum ad puniendos* malos homines *mittere* bonos angelos, *et ad castigandos* pios *usurpare* malos, may so far be recognised as Old Testament doctrine.

(3) Later Jewish theology, on the contrary, presents us with a fully-developed demonology, traces of which are found in the Asmodeus of the apocryphal Book of Tobit.

SECOND DIVISION.

MAN'S RELIGIOUS AND MORAL RELATION TO GOD.

I. DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE CEREMONIAL AND THE MORAL LAW.

§ 201.

The ceremonial and moral precepts are (as has been shown in Part I. § 84) in the Mosaic law co-ordinate. The object and meaning of the law are, however, shown, as was there pointed out, on the one hand, by the motives set forth for fulfilling the commands; on the other, by the fact that even the ceremonial ordinances are everywhere translucent with a spiritual meaning. Hence it is but a result of that tuition of the law which advances from the outer to the inner, that prophecy should carry out the distinction between the ceremonial and the moral law, and emphatically declare that the performance of the external ordinances of the law, and especially the offering of sacrifice, were, as merely outward acts, worthless; that the will of God aimed at the sanctification of

Digitized by Google

the heart and the surrender of the will to God; and that the observance of the ceremonial law had no value except as the expression of a godly disposition. The words of Samuel to Saul (1 Sam. xv. 22, § 164, and note 3) may in this respect, as we have already remarked, be regarded as the programme of prophecy. The same thought forms the theme of many prophetic addresses; comp. as chief passages Hos. vi. 6, Amos v. 21 sqq., Isa. i. 11 sqq., lviii. 3 sqq., Jer. v. 20, vii. 21 sqq., xiv. 12, Mic. vi. 6 sqq. (1). Many passages in the Psalms also declare obedience to the Divine will, the thwarting of self-will and pride, and the struggle for the purification of the inner man, to be the sacrifice acceptable to God; comp. Ps. xl. 7, l., li. 18 sq. So, too, a godly conversation and all that appertains thereto is often the subject of psalms in which not a word is said of sacrifice; see *e.g.* how purity of heart and conduct are brought forward, Ps. xxiv. 4–6, and xv., as the tokens by which the genuine covenant people are to be recognised. On the other hand, however, the experience of the Divine favour is, in the view of the Psalmist, connected with the sanctuary and its acts of worship, on which account these are the objects of delight and aspiration; comp. xxvi. 7 sq., xxvii. 4, Ps. xlii. sq., lxiii., lxxxiv. The latter contains a hint of the manner in which the polemics of the prophets against the rites of worship must be regarded. According to a view frequently advanced, the prophets are said to have taken exception to sacrificial services in general, while Jeremiah in particular is declared to have refused to sacrifice the character of a Divine institution (so Hitzig, Graf, and others); see vi. 20, but especially vii. 22 sq. (2). Nor are these passages to be got over by the distinction that the private sacrifices of the law were for the most part voluntary, that the law merely prescribed the manner in which they should be offered (so Schmieder), and that the positive injunction of sacrifice related chiefly to public offerings, of which Jeremiah was not here speaking. Nor can Jeremiah's recognition of the ceremonial law be argued from the

Digitized by Google

fact that he speaks so severely against the desecration of the Sabbath, the commandment to hallow it being found in the Decalogue. If, however, Jeremiah had actually rejected the whole law of sacrifice, how comes he to have admitted sacrificial service into his announcement of the times of salvation, not only in xxxiii. 18,—a passage whose genuineness has been groundlessly disputed,—but also in xvii. 26, xxxi. 14, xxxiii. 11? The fact is, that in the passages above quoted from Jeremiah and others, a *relative* contrast is expressed as an *absolute* one, for the sake of laying the whole stress upon one member of the contrast (3): God so greatly desires heart service,—the demand of this is so entirely the main point,—that He is said not to desire sacrifice in comparison therewith. Burnt-offering and sacrifice He does not desire, in the sense in which a self-righteous generation, assuming that He needed such sacrifices, and thinking to satisfy Him by such an external performance, would offer them. Where, however, there is a right state of heart, and God therefore graciously returns to His people, external offerings are acceptable to Him as proofs of inward devotion (4). Hence the exhortation, Ps. iv. 6, "Offer זִבְחֵי צֶדֶק, sacrifices of righteousness" (5), comp. Deut. xxxiii. 19; and hence Ps. li., which in ver. 18 declares a broken heart to be the true sacrifice, concludes, ver. 20 sq., with the words: "Do good in Thy good pleasure unto Zion; build Thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt-offerings and whole burnt-offerings: then shall they offer bullocks upon Thine altar." It was for this reason, too, that the prophets, as has been already shown with respect to Jeremiah, expressly assume that the church of the future will have an external ritual, though without sin-offerings (because sin is forgiven). Thus Deutero-Isaiah, *e.g.* lxvi. 1–3, who declares that no temple is to be built by the sin-defiled mass of the exiles, and calls their sacrifices an abomination, yet predicts, lvi. 7, lx. 7, lxvi. 20, for the New Jerusalem a new temple and a new sacrificial service.

Digitized by Google

These considerations also sufficiently condemn the assertion that the above-mentioned prophets are opposed by others, who are chargeable with a one-sided *Levitism*, for insisting upon the observance of the ceremonial law. These latter are said to be Ezekiel, Daniel, and Malachi (comp. De Wette, *Einleitung*, 6th ed. § 223, 8th ed. § 278). Ezekiel certainly does set a high value upon the external ordinances of the Mosaic law. And this is quite in keeping with the priestly character of this prophet, who emphatically declares, iv. 14, that he had never in his life eaten anything unclean; who contends, as Jeremiah had also done (see above, and comp. also Isa. lviii. 13 sq.), for the sanctification of the Sabbath, ch. xx., as being a sign between Jehovah and His people, ver. 12; and who describes at great length in the prophecy, ch. xl.–xlviii., the restoration of the Levitical ritual upon a magnificent scale in the coming times of redemption,—a subject to which Jeremiah also briefly alludes. That he did not, however, regard sanctification as consisting in such externalism, is shown not only by his description of the righteous man (in ch. xviii.) as one who practises no idolatry, commits no adultery or unchastity, is not harsh to his debtor, is merciful to the needy, and does not seek to enrich himself in unrighteous ways, but more especially by his predictions, hereafter to be considered, of the restoration of Israel as the covenant people. For the essential condition of this restoration is to be the outpouring of that Divine Spirit which shall create in them a new heart, xi. 19, xxxvi. 26, an inward conversion being thus reflected in these external ordinances. It must, moreover, be remembered how important the observance of these ritual observances was (as remarked § 188), especially during the captivity, as a means of fencing the people from intercourse with their heathen conquerors (6). It is true also that Malachi sternly rebukes transgressions in the matter of Divine worship, the offering of bad or defective sacrifices, i. 6–ii. 9, the fraudulent detention of the temple dues, iii. 7–12; but he does so because the worldly and godless disposition of priests and people

Digitized by Google

was manifested by such actions. It is those sacrifices which the people, purified by judgments, shall offer in righteousness (בִּצְדָקָה), will be pleasant to the Lord, iii. 3 sq.

Finally, with respect to the Book of Daniel, the attempt to show that it is opposed to the older prophetical books, by its commendations of a legal externalism, is equally and utterly vain. Daniel abstains, i. 8 sqq., from partaking of the dainties of the royal table, because he considers them defiling,—not exactly in the sense in which, in the passage Hos. ix. 4 (elsewhere, § 136, and note 2, discussed in a different connection), the food of the people in captivity is called polluted (7), but undoubtedly because at the royal repasts it would be impossible to avoid violations of the Mosaic injunctions concerning different kinds of food, and the participation of flesh sacrificed to idols. Equal strictness is, however, shown not only by Ezekiel, xxii. 26, xliv. 23, but also by Deutero-Isaiah, in the passages against the eating of swine's flesh and other unclean animals, lxv. 4, lxvi. 17. It has been also said to be a sign of the externalism of Daniel's religion, that, according to vi. 17, he prayed three times daily, a custom alluded to so early as Ps. lv. 18. This, however, can give offence to those only who consider it unfavourable to piety to have any set times of prayer, while the circumstance of his turning in prayer towards Jerusalem, as already required 1 Kings viii. (comp. § 62), was at this time of captivity a very natural expression of that heartfelt yearning towards the holy city which would possess every Israelite who believed in the Divine promises. The chief stress is, however, laid upon Dan. iv. 27, which is said to attribute a propitiatory power to almsgiving. Daniel here says to Nebuchadnezzar: "Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and break off thy sins by righteousness (8), and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor, if it may be a lengthening of thy tranquillity." In thus speaking, however, he is not inculcating a righteousness of dead works, but pointing out to Nebuchadnezzar the particulars in which especially his change of heart would be shown, just as

Digitized by Google

when the Apostle Paul urged the heathen, Rom. ii. 7, *καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητεῖν*; comp. ver. 10. The exegesis which could find in Daniel the notion that sin might be expiated and prosperity ensured by almsgiving, would also find in Isaiah (ch. lviii.)—the prophet to whom none have yet denied the spirit of genuine prophecy—that fasting is indeed displeasing to God, but that external exercises of benevolence and external observance of the Sabbath furnish a claim to Divine favour and constitute human righteousness, while the prophet is only naming those external works in which genuine piety will be chiefly manifested. How far the Book of Daniel is from commending a righteousness of dead works, is best seen by the incisive penitential prayer, ch. ix.

(1) In Mic. vi. 6 sqq. the prophet says: "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the most high God? shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" A similar testimony accompanies every restoration of outward worship from David onwards.

(2) In Jer. vi. 20, the prophet represents the Lord as saying: "Your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices pleasing unto me;" and vii. 22 sq.: "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you," etc. The latter passage has of late been the subject of so much discussion, especially with respect to the criticism of the Pentateuch, that it must hereafter be more particularly noticed.

(3) See how Winer, *Grammatik des neutest. Sprachidioms*,

Digitized by Google

sec. 7, p. 462 sq., and Buttmann, *Grammatik des neutest. Sprachgebrauchs*, p. 306, elucidate this subject by a series of examples.

(4) As Samuel himself, according to the account in the First Book of Samuel, ministered at the sacrificial service.

(5) In Ps. iv. 6, זֶבַח is not itself the offering to be brought.

(6) Ezekiel may have contributed not a little to the Levitical spirit which prevailed after the captivity, though its degeneration did not originate with him.

(7) The passage Hos. ix. 4 also shows the importance attributed to sacrifice even by Hosea, notwithstanding his polemics against the *opus operatum*.

(8) It is quite gratuitous to make צְדָקָה here exactly = almsgiving.

II. THE RUINOUS NATURE OF SIN. THE NEED OF A NEW DISPENSATION OF GRACE.

§ 202.

In proportion as a consciousness of the inwardness of the law's requirements is arrived at, will the conviction of sin become profound. It is in this respect that prophecy, by bringing into greater prominence the *opposition* in which the people stand to the electing and sanctifying purpose of their God, carries on the office of the law, nay, advances to the perception that that sanctification of the people at which the law aims is unattainable during the present legal dispensation, and must, on the contrary, be effected by a new dispensation of grace.

The pedagogy of the law, making man conscious of the contrast he exhibits to the Divine will, by holding this up before him as in a mirror, and effecting *a conviction of sin* by its testimony against the people, Deut. xxxi. 26,—this pedagogy is one which advances but gradually. We cannot expect at once to find in the Old Testament such an *ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας* as is expressed in Rom. vii. When the godly man of the Old Testament meditated on the law, and strove to live in obedience

Digitized by Google

thereto, its first impression was a reviving one, Ps. xiv. 9 sqq. He obtained, by its enlightening effect, a delight in the commandments of God, and thus the law relatively abode within him, as it is said, xxxvii. 31, "The law of his God is in his heart;" and he attained something of that free spirit, li. 14, by which he could say, xl. 8, "I delight to do Thy will, O my God: yea, Thy law is within my heart." But even in the psalm (xix.) already quoted, the praise of the law is combined, 13 sq., with a prayer for the pardon of secret sins of infirmity and for preservation from presumptuous sins; and a feeling of man's inability to come up to the requirements of the law is thus betrayed. When David, too, after falling into gross sin, prayed, li. 12, "Create in me a clean heart, O God (בְּרָא־לִי), and renew a right spirit within me;" and, ver. 14, "Uphold me with Thy free Spirit," comp. cxliii. 10, he expressed an acknowledgment that a Divine impartation of life, a transformation of heart, was needed before man's nature could attain to conformity with the Divine will. Such an acknowledgment is made by *prophecy*. But at this stage the question instituted is: How has the nation conformed to its Divine destination? How far has a church consecrated to God been really formed under the ordinances of the law? In making this inquiry, however, prophecy encounters on every side a falling away from God, which, after the failure of every remedy, proves that the vocation of the covenant people is not to be realized under the existing dispensation. The course followed in this respect by prophetic addresses is generally as follows:—1. *What has God done for Israel? has He omitted aught of mercy or discipline* which might conduce to the deliverance of His people, as the remedy of their faults? and 2. *How have the people requited His love and care? how can they meet their God if He enters into judgment with them?* Comp. such prophetic passages as Isa. i. 5, Mic. vi., Jer. ii. 1, iii. 5, and many others. To render evident that relation of electing and sanctifying love into which God has entered with His people, the prophets do indeed employ also the figure of *fatherhood and*

Digitized by Google

sonship, discussed in vol. i. (§ 82. 1); see *e.g.* Hos. xi. 1 (comp. § 82, note 1), Isa. i. 1, 2 sqq.(1), xxxi. 9, and other passages there quoted. But *the bridal and conjugal relation* is far more frequently used by them as the *symbol of the communion into which God has entered with His people* (2). This is done especially by the prophets Hosea, Deutero-Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. It may suffice to suggest the allegory in Ezek. xvi. and Jer. ii. 2 sq., already mentioned in a different connection (§ 27, 88, note 2)(3). *How then does the nation now appear?* It is become the *whore* and *adulteress*. In this symbol, sin is no longer mere disobedience to the commands of Him who has a right to demand obedience, but is viewed as being in its inward and essential nature a *breach of faith*, as *base ingratitude* toward one who loves. It is true that it is chiefly apostasy to strange gods and to heathen practices in general which are regarded, *e.g.* in Hos. ii., Jer. iii. 1 sqq., etc., after the example of Lev. xx. 6, in the light of whoredom (זְנוּת). Still every kind of rebellion against God falls under this same condemnation, inasmuch as in every sin man sets himself in opposition to Him who alone has acquired a right to the full submission of the heart; compare already Num. xiv. 33, also *e.g.* Isa. i. 21, in connection with the preceding, Ps. lxxiii. 27, comp. with ver. 26 and other passages (4). Considered in this light, all boasting of human righteousness vanishes, and an overwhelming feeling of guilt is expressed in many prophetic discourses. It is chiefly a common guilt resting upon the nation, and making the nation as such, the whole community, the object of the Divine wrath, which is spoken of. In Mic. vii. 9, *e.g.*, it is Israel who says, "I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against Him;" while in Deutero-Isaiah, especially, it is repeatedly declared that the people have no claim with respect to God, that all their righteousness is vain, that they have incurred only punishment and rejection, and are indebted for every benefit they receive to the free grace of God, xliii. 24, xlviii. 8–11, etc. In Dan. ix. 4 sqq., too, especially ver. 18, the same feeling is

Digitized by Google

expressed (5). From this general sinfulness, moreover, the more religious of the nation, the servants of God, are not so exempt as to be opposed as the absolutely righteous to the *perdita massa*. An Isaiah knows himself, vi. 5, not only to be dwelling in the midst of an unclean people, but also to be himself a man of unclean lips, and therefore to need Divine atonement and cleansing before he can undertake the office of a reprover. Caspari (*über Micha*, p. 336) is certainly mistaken when he so understands the passage (Mic. vii. 9) as to exclude the godly from the confession of sin there made by the people. Deutero-Isaiah also exclaims, xliii. 27: "Thy first father (*i.e.* Abraham or Jacob, comp. § 74) hath sinned, and thine advocates (intercessors, מְלִיצִים, therefore such men as Moses, Samuel, Elijah, and other prophets, who by their godliness and intercessions had stood in the breach for the people) have transgressed against me." The same prophet, moreover, in the prayer lxiv. 5, "We are all as an unclean thing, all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away," does not exclude himself from this communion of sin and guilt; and Ps. cxxx. 3, "If Thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?" is of general application.

The history of the people having thus shown that they had failed at the present stage of revelation to attain that righteousness which avails before God, and to realize the purpose of their election, the perception forced itself on the mind that a *new dispensation of grace* was needed; in other words, that God must of His own free grace blot out transgression, and, as the passage Deut. xxx. 6 (discussed vol. i. § 8, note 4, and § 90) hints, effect by a new communication of life that conformity to His will which the law demands. The chief passages in which this is expressed are found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Thus in Jer. xxiv. 7 the prophet declares that God will give to the people, whom He will bring again to their own land, a heart to know Him; with which may be compared Isaiah's announce-

Digitized by Google

ment, that God will in the times of redemption *give* to the people that susceptibility for the reception of His word which they now lack; see xxix. 18 sqq., xxx. 20 sq., xxxii. 3, in opposition to xxix. 9 sqq., xxx. 9. The principal passage, however, in which the contrast between the future and the old dispensation is brought forward, is that important prediction of the *new covenant*, xxxi. 31 sqq.: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they brake." Then follow the words וְאָנֹכִי בָּעַלְתִּי בָם, which may be understood, "when I had betrothed them to myself," or more correctly, "though I am lord over them" (6). It is further said: "But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." The chief thing, or rather the fundamental assumption in this new dispensation is, as the passage from Jeremiah expresses at its close, the *abolition of the old condemnation by Divine mercy*, that God, as the prophet Micah says, vii. 19, should of His mercy subdue the iniquities of His people, and cast all their sins into the depths of the sea. The expression יִכְבֹּשׁ עֲוֹנֹתֵינוּ in the last passage implies that the sin of the people had become a power which only the grace of God could overcome. But the whole difficulty of the task of training Israel is expressed in the passage, Isa. xliii. 24, where the God who calls worlds into existence by His word says, when speaking of His many and vain attempts to rescue His people from their sins, "Thou hast made me to serve with thy

Digitized by Google

sins, thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities" (7). It is through the pardon of sin that occasion is afforded for the *agency of those purifying and sanctifying forces* which God puts forth,—a fact thus expressed, Ezek. xxxvi. 25–27: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean," etc. That which was signified by the legal rites of purification shall then become a reality. Zechariah also prophesies, xiii. 1, of the fountain to be opened in the times of redemption for sin and uncleanness. Now then there is no longer cause to exclaim with Deut. v. 29, "O that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always;" for God will, according to the prospect held out, xxx. 6 (comp. § 88), of a circumcision of the heart, work in them a susceptibility for the Divine, a willingness to perform His will. The people no longer encounter the law in its rigid objectivity; but God will, in the times of the new covenant, write it in their hearts, and, as Ezekiel continues in the passage quoted, "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh; and I will put my Spirit within you, and *cause* you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them" (comp. xi. 19 sq., xxxvii. 23–27). How that direct teaching of God spoken of in the passage of Jeremiah, "They shall no more teach every man his neighbour," etc., is combined herewith, will be subsequently discussed (§ 223).

(1) Isa. i. 2: "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me."

(2) A notion which at the same time testifies to the moral depth attributed by the prophets to this earthly relation.

(3) Ezek. xvi. The people in Egypt was a poor, helpless, abandoned child: "I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thine own blood. I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live." (It grew up a maiden, still in poverty and nakedness.) And when the time was come that God could woo His people, "I sware unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee (at

Digitized by Google

Sinai), . . . thou becamest mine." According to Jer. ii. 2, the leading in the wilderness was the time of espousal, etc.

(4) Num. xiv. 33 uses זְנוּת of the declension of the people in general. Isa. i. 21: "How is the faithful city become an harlot!" The contrast exhibited, Ps. lxxiii., between vers. 26 and 27 is specially to be observed. To the godly man who says, "God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever," are opposed those that are far from God, that go a whoring from Him (כָּל־זֹנֶה מִמֶּךָּ).

(5) Dan. ix. 18: "We do not present our supplications before Thee for our righteousness, but for Thy great mercies."

(6) Comp. Jer. iii. 14. Similarly, but too specifically, does Ewald understand, "though I was their protector." Luther's translation, "and I was obliged to constrain them," would give an excellent thought, but is linguistically incorrect. The view of many moderns, corresponding with the ἠμέλησα of the LXX., and making בָּעַל = בָּחַל, to despise, to reject, is also untenable. Hengstenberg's explanation, "but I betrothe them to me," anticipates the following verse.

(7) But for *His own sake*, because He must maintain His own glory, He blots out their transgressions and remembers their sins no more.

III. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

§ 203.

The Old Testament Form of Faith.

Meanwhile the just walked in faith and lived by their faith. The law, by always pointing backwards to God's electing grace, and onwards to God's just retribution as the foundation of legal righteousness, already presupposed faith, *i.e.* such a trusting submission to the covenant God as was originally realized in Abraham's believing adherence to the Divine promise. This was in conformity with that fundamental saying, Gen. xv. 6, "He believed in the Lord, and He counted it to him for righteousness." Accordingly the requirement of faith runs

Digitized by Google

through the entire Old Testament. The leading of Israel, from the time of their deliverance out of Egypt, Ex. ix. 31, xiv. 31, comp. especially Deut. i. 32, ix. 33, and other passages, rests entirely on faith. But in proportion as their Divine election seemed to human apprehension thwarted, and the promise of redemption forfeited, by the apostasy of the nation and the judgments thereby incurred, the more emphatically was it asserted how all-important faith was as the root of all righteousness, and the condition on which the blessing was to be obtained.

The thesis of prophetism, Isa. vii. 9, runs thus: אִם לֹא תַאֲמִינוּ כִּי לֹא תֵאָמֵנוּ, "If ye do not believe, truly ye shall not remain;" it is the saying uttered by the prophet to Ahaz when he sought help from Assyria (§ 181); comp. 2 Chron. xx. 20 (1). *What then is this faith? Negatively speaking, it is a ceasing from all natural confidence in one's own strength and power, a renunciation of all trust in human support and assistance.* Accordingly Jeremiah thus describes unbelief, xvii. 5: "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm" (which was just what Ahaz had done). *Positively*, it is a fastening or support; for this is the proper meaning of הֶאֱמִין, namely, a *fastening of the heart upon the Divine word of promise, a leaning upon the power and faithfulness of God*, by reason of which He can and will effect what He chooses in spite of all earthly obstacles, and therefore a resting upon the צוּר־לֵבָב, Ps. lxxiii. 26. Compare what is said Ps. cxii. 7 sq. of the just man: נָכוֹן לִבּוֹ בָּטֵחַ בַּיהוָה: סָמוּךְ לִבּוֹ לֹא יִירָא ("His heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord; his heart is established, he shall not be afraid"). On its negative side, whereby faith renounces self-chosen human ways, it is a *resting in, a quiet waiting upon God*, Isa. xxx. 15, comp. with viii. 17, Ps. lxii. 6, and other passages, which resting involves a fearlessness of all the threats of men, Jer. viii. 12, and especially xxviii. 16: הַמַּאֲמִין לֹא יָחִישׁ (2). On its positive, it is a sanctifying of the Lord, viii. 13, a giving of glory to His sole sovereignty, comp. Jer. xiii. 16. If הֶאֱמִין designates faith as the

Digitized by Google

act of fastening, of supporting the heart, נָאַמְן and the *nomen abstractum* אֱמוּנָה (which, according to its original meaning, signifies firmness, Ex. xvii. 12) denote the state of firmness and constancy of heart in cleaving to God and His promise. So especially in that chief passage, Hab. ii. 4, צַדִּיק בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ יִחְיֶה ("the just shall live by his faith"), where the אֱמוּנָה of the just forms a contrast to the pride and arrogance of the Chaldean, who, according to i. 11, makes his power his God. Hence we find, as already hinted (§ 83), that besides adherence to the law as revealing God's commands, a cleaving to the promise as revealing God's grace, a patient waiting and hoping for complete redemption, formed an essential feature in the delineation of the servant of Jehovah, the religious and moral ideal of the Old Testament. Compare the other chief passage, Isa. l. 10, where the faith of the Lord's servant is contrasted with the effort to attain an end by deeds of violence, to obtain deliverance by force of human power (3).

In its expectation of the fulfilment of the Divine promise, the faith of the Old Testament turns to *the future*. It includes *patience* (*ὑπομονή*) and *hope* (*ἐλπίς*); קָוָה, Isa. xxv. 9; תִּקְוָה, דֹּמֶם, Ps. lxii. 6; חָכָה (waiting), Isa. viii. 15, Hab. ii. 3; יָחַל, הוֹחִיל, Ps. xlii. 6, etc. It is according to this specially Old Testament form that *πίστις* is illustrated by Old Testament examples in Heb. xi. But the Old Testament is also acquainted with the faith which includes *negatively that renunciation of one's own claims and merits before God which arises from a conviction of sin, and positively that surrender to the sin-annulling God and His atoning grace* which are essential to the *fides salvifica* of the new covenant. A chief passage in this respect is Ps. cxxx. 3–5 (4). Here faith appears as a waiting upon the word which proclaims forgiveness of sins; but here, too, its eye is directed to the future (on which see next §). It is, however, in Deutero-Isaiah that this faith is especially enforced. This book announces not only the vanity of all human power and strength, declaring that all flesh is grass, and its glory as the

Digitized by Google

flower of the field, and that only the word of God abideth for ever, xl. 6 sqq., but (as also already remarked, § 202) proclaims in a series of passages the nothingness of human merits, the insufficiency of all human performances to attain a righteousness valid in God's sight, and directs men to appropriate God's gracious offers of pardon (5). The word הֶאֱמִין is not, indeed, used for faith in its aspect of an appropriation of pardon, but the act itself is spoken of. The expressions used for it are שׁוּב אֶל, to return, to turn with confidence, Isa. xliv. 22 (6), or the stronger שׁוּב עַד, Hos. xiv. 2 (7), etc. Also: to seek God (בָּקַשׁ, דָּרַשׁ), Deut. iv. 29 ("with all the heart and with all the soul"), Jer. xxix. 13. This believing self-surrender is further designated as supplication for mercy (תַּחֲנוּנִים), Jer. xxxi. 9; and Zechariah especially makes the future conversion of the people to result from God pouring out upon them, xii. 10, the spirit of grace and supplication (רוּחַ חֵן וְתַחֲנוּנִים) (8).

(1) 2 Chron. xx. 20 is almost identical: הַאֲמִינוּ בַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְתֵאָמֵנוּ, "Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established."

(2) Isa. xxviii. 16: "He that believeth must not fear,"—יָחִישׁ denoting anxious restlessness.

(3) Isa. l. 10: "Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of His servant? let him, when he walketh in darkness and hath no light, trust in the name of the Lord, and stay himself (יִשָּׁעֵן) upon his God." On the other hand, it is said with respect to those who (rebelliously) kindle a fire and light up flames, "they are given up a prey to their own fire, they shall lie down in sorrow."

(4) Ps. cxxx. 3–5: "If thou shouldst mark iniquities, . . . who shall stand? but there is forgiveness with Thee. . . . I wait for the Lord, my soul doth wait; and in His word do I hope."

(5) Comp. the close of Isa. xliii. (§ 202, with note 7).

(6) Isa. xliv. 22: "I have blotted out as a cloud thy transgressions: . . . return (שׁוּבָה) to me, for I have redeemed thee."

(7) עַד expresses that the movement of turning attains its end.

(8) See more on this subject in the description of the Messianic times, § 223.

Digitized by Google

§ 204.

The Old Testament Experience of Salvation.

Our next inquiry is, *How far did this appointed way of salvation*, that man laying hold by faith on the grace of God should find forgiveness, *hold good during the Old Testament dispensation?* Are we to say that the just man not only walked in the faith of a future fulfilment of the promise and a future redemption, but also rejoiced in the present possession of salvation, and had an assurance that his sins were pardoned? In other words, *was there already in Old Testament times the experience of justification and adoption in the New Testament sense of these terms?* This difficult question was especially discussed in the *Cocceian disputations*, Coccejus maintaining that the old covenant furnished only a *πάρεσις*, a *pretermissio*, a *dissimulatio* of sin, according to which, although satisfaction has not been made for sin, God does not punish it; but not an *ἄφεσις ἁμαρτίας*, a proper *remissio* (1). In this matter the question is whether, besides the pardon which, as we saw in the doctrine of sacrifice (§ 137), was obtained for *sins of infirmity* by confession and sacrifice (*e.g.* Lev. v. 10: וְנִסְלַח לוֹ, comp. also Ps. xix. 13), there was also pardon for *presumptuous sins*, which could not be atoned for by sacrifice, and therefore a justification of the whole man. To this we reply as follows:—The Old Testament certainly teaches by word and fact—by the latter in the history of the nation as well as in the experience of godly individuals—that Divine forgiveness is imparted to the sinner who turns in penitence and faith to God; and that this is not a mere ignoring of sin, a silence (הֶחֱרִישׁ) on the part of God with respect to it, such as He might for a season observe in the case also of the ungodly (as in Ps. l. 21), but, as Nathan declares to the repentant David, a causing the guilt of sin to pass away (יְהוָה הֶעֱבִיר חַטָּאתְךָ), a removing it to a distance, or, as it is expressed Job xxxiii. 26, He restores unto man his righteousness (יָשֵׁב

Digitized by Google

לְאֱנוֹשׁ צִדְקָתוֹ). It is a replacing the sinner in a state in which, as conforming to the Divine will, he is accepted by God, and becomes an object of the Divine complacency. God desires to be known as gracious and compassionate. "There is forgiveness (הַסְּלִיחָה) with Thee," says the Psalmist, cxxx. 4, "that Thou mayest be feared," *i.e.* that Thou mayest be in Thy forgiving mercy an object of veneration. Forgiveness of sins is an act which God performs for His name's sake, as it is expressed lxxix. 9. Hence the Old Testament speaks not only of the restlessness of him who conceals his sins, or forgives them himself, but also of the peace of him who is absolved from sin by the verdict of God. To this subject belong the whole of Ps. xxxii. and Prov. xxviii. 13, with which must be connected the passages in which the mercy of God towards contrite and humble hearts is spoken of, Ps. li., xxxiv., xix., etc. Hence we find not only ascriptions of praise for the future atonement, like Mic. vii. 18 sqq., but also thanksgivings for pardon received, like Ps. ciii. *This experience of salvation, however, still remains but relative, and decidedly differs from that of the New Testament.* In the first place, it does indeed afford peace of mind concerning individual sins, nay, for the moment, concerning the whole standing of the sinful subject before God; but not resting on an objective and permanent atonement obtained for the church, it does not establish *any permanent state of reconciliation*. That which applies to the church as a whole with respect to the insufficiency of the ministry of reconciliation established in it,—viz. that it was to the future that it must look for a perfect atonement and pardon, comp. Zech. iii. 8 sqq. (2), Ps. cxxx. 7 sq.: "O Israel, wait for the Lord; He *will* redeem Israel from all his sins,"—applies also, notwithstanding the inward nature of the expiation, Ps. li. 19, to the individual also. Not such atoning grace and justification were imparted to him as to enable him to say with the apostle: "Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." He was pacified concerning the past, but only to begin again seeking to be henceforth just through the

Digitized by Google

works of the law. Feelings of love and gratitude to God, who had thus forgiven him, were aroused within him, and he experienced somewhat of the assistance of that Divine Spirit who creates willingness in man. But, *in the second place*, there was not in him, until the ἄνθρωπος πνευματικός appeared in Christ, *an indwelling of this Spirit*, in virtue of which a subversion of the old foundations of his life was effected, and the σπέρμα of a new and spiritual personality, of a spiritual man, implanted in him. This is aptly expressed by Rougemont (*Christus und seine Zeugen*), when he says that under the Old Testament conversion was indeed reached as a moral change, but not regeneration as a new creation. It is true that spiritual energies were already active within the psychical province; but even the very highest operation of the Divine Spirit in the Old Testament, viz. the gift of prophecy (comp. § 161), continued to be, as we shall soon see, an extraordinary condition, and one which even interfered in a violent manner with the ordinary course of its possessor's life. And it was just because, *in the third place*, the Divine Spirit did not make in the Old Testament saints a new foundation of life,—did not as yet work outwards from within, as the transforming principle of the whole man,—that *the conquest of death and everlasting life were not effected.* The individual might indeed be for the moment raised above death and the grave, comp. Ps. lxxiii. 26, etc. (and this subject will be discussed Part III.), but then death was but concealed under a veil. The deliverance from death connected with the pardon of sin in the Old Testament was only a transitory deliverance, a postponement of temporal death. It was in this sense that Nathan said unto David, 2 Sam. xii. 13, "Thou shalt not die;" in this that Job, the sick man, who had found forgiveness of sins, said, xxxiii. 28, "He has redeemed my soul from going into the pit, and my life shall see the light;" and in this also that the Psalmist exclaimed, ciii. 2 sqq., "Praise the Lord, O my soul, . . . who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; *who redeemeth thy life from destruction;* who

Digitized by Google

crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercies." And when Habakkuk enounces the proposition, "The just shall live," בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ (comp. § 203), it refers to deliverance and preservation under impending judgments, to such as was, *e.g.*, expressed in the words of Jeremiah to Baruch, Jer. xlv. 5: "Thy life will I give thee for a prey" (comp. xxi. 9). It is a temporary deliverance from death, but the sentence of death is not cancelled. Hence how differently from Job xxx. 28 sound the thanksgivings of the justified in Rom. viii., when the Spirit of the risen Redeemer is energizing in the redeemed! Hence, too, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews declares, xi. 40, that before the redemption of the New Testament, the fathers of the old covenant were not partakers of the τελείωσις.

From what has been advanced, it may be seen how much was wanting under the Old Testament dispensation to the full restoration of a filial relation towards God. The notion of *Divine sonship* as conferred upon the nation in general (§ 82. 1), and then upon the theocratic king (§ 165, with note 7), nay, as affirmed in a special sense of the godly (Ps. lxxiii. 15, דּוֹר בָּנֶיךָ, the race of thy sons), was still but a notion, to be fully realized only in the future. The highest relation of intercourse between God and man, instituted by prophecy, does not attain to the eminence of that filial state inaugurated by the New Testament; for which reason Christ declares the greatest of the prophets to be less than the least in His kingdom, Matt. xi. 11.

(1) Information concerning this controversy will be found in Buddeus, in his *Institutio theol. dogmat.* Coccejus was opposed not only by Alting and Leydecker, but also by Witsius, *De œconomia fœderum Dei*, ed. 4, p. 786 sqq. (comp. § 11). Among moderns, comp. especially Fr. v. Rougemont's work, *Le Christ et ses temoins*, which contains a series of apt remarks on this subject.

(2) According to Zech. iii. 8 sq., the priesthood pointed only in a type (מוֹפֵת) to the future Redeemer (comp. § 200).

Digitized by Google

THIRD DIVISION.

OF PROPHECY (1).

FIRST SUBDIVISION.

THE PROPHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS.

§ 205.

Negative Propositions.

Although the natural gifts and personal qualifications of one called to the prophetic office formed the individual presupposition of his prophetic vocation, and though the ministrations of a prophet were objectively conditioned by the state of affairs, and the testimony of each prophet connected with all the revealed testimony of his predecessors, still *that which made the prophet a prophet was not his natural gifts nor his own intention, and that which he proclaimed as the prophetic word was not the mere result of instruction received nor the product of his own reflection.*

Older theology certainly erred in too widely severing the prophecy from its connection both with the individuality, the moral and intellectual idiosyncrasy of the prophet, and with the objective historical circumstances in which it had its roots, thus conceiving of the individual prophet as inserted in the age like a *deus ex machina.* It is quite certain, however, that neither personal inclination, nor natural endowment, nor human training could make a prophet, and equally so that the knowledge obtained by instruction or study was incapable of producing a prophecy. However true it may be that a certain learned education was imparted in the so-called schools of the prophets (§§ 162 and 174), and yet more so that the prophets were themselves assiduous students of the law, the history of Israel, and the older prophecies, still the prophet differs essentially from the later scribe and Rabbinist. It is not his to say, "It is

Digitized by Google

written," or, "Such and such a master teaches," but, "Thus saith the Lord," or, "The word of the Lord came to me, saying," etc. (2). The true prophets were not the לִמּוּדִים of a human teacher, but of the Lord (comp. Isa. l. 4). Hence it is that Amos declines (vii. 14) to be numbered among the titular prophets of the guild or school. The matter of prophecy is also as distinct from aught that could be devised or discovered by reflection, as it is from the results of human learning. So little, indeed, is what the prophet predicts derived from his own heart or intellect, that the characteristic of the false prophets is declared to be that they speak that which they have themselves devised. These latter are designated, Ezek. xiii. 2 sq., as prophets out of their own hearts, who follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing; they speak, according to Jer. xxiii. 16, a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord; they steal, ver. 30 sq., the word of God from the true prophets; they use their tongues and predict like them. (Of course, in the case of the true prophets, reflection plays its part, but it is exercised upon matter objectively received.) The prophets strictly distinguish between the word of Jehovah and their own views and desires. Very instructive in this respect is the Book of Habakkuk. In ch. i. he complains, first, of the corruption of the times, then of the tyranny of the secular power which God had made the instrument of His judgments. To these complaints he receives, ch. ii., the Divine answer which furnishes the solution of the enigma, whereupon the subjective emotion of the prophet is poured forth in a song of praise in ch. iii.

(1) The prophetic office and its position in the theocracy were described in the historical section (§ 161 sq.), in which a review of the historical development of the prophethood was also given. Our task now is to treat more particularly of prophecy as the medium of Divine revelation. Since, however, the nature of this revelation can only be understood by a just appreciation of the mental condition of the prophet who is its

Digitized by Google

organ, we must now discuss more fully this latter point,—in other words, the question how the prophetic consciousness is to be defined and explained,—a question which was already a source of controversy even in the earliest ages of the church. The course we propose to take in this matter is, first, to lay down those general propositions concerning which there can be, so far as the authority of plain scriptural statements is deferred to, no disagreement; then to state the chief views which have been held on disputed points, and, by examining these several views, to smooth the way to more particular positive definitions. Hence this division is divided into two subdivisions, the first of which treats of the Prophetic Consciousness, the second of Prophecy. Comp. especially, with respect to the historical element, my article *Weissagung* in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* xvii. p. 626 sqq. Bruno Bauer has discussed this point more thoroughly than others. Among the numerous monographs, that of Tholuck (*Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*, 1860, ed. ii. 1861) must be specially mentioned.

(2) It is not our intention to set up any theory of prophecy apart from Old Testament statements, but to listen to what the prophets themselves tell us.

§ 206.

Positive Propositions.

The prophet, as such, knows himself to be the organ of Divine revelation, in virtue both of a Divine vocation, capable of being known by him as such, and which came to him with irresistible power, and also of his endowment with the enlightening, sanctifying, and strengthening Spirit of God. Accordingly, a prophet knows the objective reality, as the word of God, of that word which he proclaims.

1. The prophets know nothing of a moment at which the resolution to devote themselves to the prophetic vocation came to maturity, though they do know of one when God called them and appointed them to be prophets, even against their own desire, and by the subjugation of their own timidity. The

Digitized by Google

overwhelming constraint of the Divine call is described by Amos in the discourse (iii. 8) in which he vindicates his prophetic office (1). He says that he felt like a shepherd whom the roaring of a lion fills with fear, when the Lord said unto him (vii. 15), as he was following the flock, "Go and prophesy unto my people Israel." Isaiah, ch. vi., and Ezekiel, ch. i. sq., refer their call to visions, in which the glory of the Lord was manifested to them. But the Book of Jeremiah furnishes the most abundant proofs of the certainty the prophets felt concerning their Divine vocation. Jeremiah well knew that the events of his life, from the first moment of his existence, had been ordered with reference to his prophetic vocation (comp. i. 4). This had not, however, the effect of producing in him a resolution to embrace this vocation; for even when the Divine call actually came, he resisted it (ver. 6) on the plea of his youth. He testifies, xx. 7 sqq., that the Lord persuaded and prevailed; he asserts that, amidst the sorrows which his prophetic office brought upon him, he would willingly have restrained the Divine impulse, but was unable to do so; comp. xvii. 16 (2). It was in virtue of such assurance that the call he had received was from God, that he condemned the pretensions of false prophets (ch. xxiii., comp. ch. xxviii. and xxix. 24–32). And as it was not by his own choice that any man was called to be a prophet, so also it is generally true with regard to prophetic revelations, that they could not be forced either by the prophets themselves or by any others. For there were seasons during which God's intercourse with His people by means of prophetic revelations was interrupted (3), such interruption being among the special tokens of approaching judgment. Thus the word of the Lord is sought in vain, Amos viii. 12; visions are in vain desired of the prophets, Ezek. vii. 26, because they no longer receive them from the Lord, Lam. ii. 19, comp. Ps. lxxiv. 9.

2. That overpowering Divine influence which the prophets experienced, is sometimes quite indefinitely designated as the hand of God coming upon them, being strong upon them, fall-

Digitized by Google

ing upon them (comp. such passages as Isa. viii. 11, Jer. xv. 17, Ezek. i. 3, iii. 14, 22, viii. 1, etc.). The medium of the revelation is, however, more particularly said to be the Spirit of God, through whom it is, Zech. vii. 12, that the Lord sends His word by means of the prophets. This Spirit proves itself to be Divine, first, by disclosing to the prophets such knowledge as could come from God alone. For while it is said to the false prophets, Jer. xxiii. 18, "Who has stood in the council of the Lord, and hath perceived and heard His word?" the saying of Amos, iii. 7, that the Lord does nothing, but He revealeth (uncovereth) His secret to His servants the prophets, applies to the true. Hence he who prophesies is called the man of uncovered eyes, Num. xxiv. 4, and the word of the Lord a thing revealed, Dan. x. 1. To lay all possible stress upon the objectivity of this word, its communication is designated as a giving (Ezek. ii. 8, iii. 3), a putting into the mouth of the prophet (Deut. xviii. 18, Jer. i. 9), etc. But even this putting of God's word into the mouth of any man does not, if it stands alone, constitute a genuine prophet. Even a Balaam, when overpowered by Jehovah, was constrained to prophesy, and a Caiaphas to proclaim truth against his own will (John xi. 51). But still more, in the second place, does the spirit show itself to be of God to the true prophet upon whom it comes, and whom it fits for his office by its *sanctifying and strengthening agency*. While God says to the ungodly, Ps. l. 16 sq., "What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth, seeing thou hatest instruction and castest my words behind thee?" while the false prophets show themselves to be deceivers by flattering the sinful lusts of the people (Mic. ii. 11, iii. 5 sqq.), the true prophet can testify of himself, Mic. iii. 8, "I am full of power by the Spirit of the Lord, and of judgment, and of might, to declare unto Jacob his transgression, and to Israel his sin." On the manner in which the prophetic spirit makes him upon whom it comes another man, compare the remarks, § 161, on 1 Sam. x. 6, 9.

Digitized by Google

3. It is in virtue of such spiritual experience that the prophet knows that the word put into his mouth will also prove itself to bear within it the power of the living God. It is nutritious like wheat, while the word of the false prophets is like chaff; it works with irresistible force like fire, and like a hammer that breaks the rocks in pieces, Jer. xxiii. 28; it is a word which proves its reality under all circumstances; it shall not return to the Lord void, but shall accomplish that which He pleases, and prosper in the thing whereto He sends it, Isa. lv. 11. Hence the prophet, as the announcer of this word, is also the performer of Divine *acts;* he is, as was said to Jeremiah, i. 10, set over nations and kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant (4).

(1) Amos iii. 8: "The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?"

(2) Jer. xvii. 16: "I did not withhold myself from following Thee as my shepherd. I have not desired the woful day (which I was obliged to prophesy); Thou knowest it: that which came out of my lips was before Thy face."

(3) Compare the passage 1 Sam. iii. 1 already quoted (§ 161).

(4) Compare *e.g.* Jer. xxv. 15 sqq. (§ 185), and many other prophetic passages of this kind.

§ 207.

Psychologic Definition of the Prophetic State in Ancient Times.

From what has been advanced, the mental condition of the prophet may be generally defined as one in which he knows himself to be under a Divine influence entirely distinct from his own subjectivity, and for that very reason finds himself to a certain extent in a *state of passivity.* This is also expressed by the passive form of his appellation נָבִיא, and the corresponding verbal designations נִבָּא and הִתְנַבֵּא (comp. § 161). *But how then is the prophetic state to be psychologically and more precisely defined?*

Digitized by Google

On this subject *various views already existed in ancient times.* The LXX. first deserve notice, inasmuch as they translate נָבִיא, נִבָּא, etc., by *προφήτης, προφητεύω*; while, on the other hand, they render קֹסֵם, קֶסֶם, קְסָמִים, which in the Old Testament are only used of false prophets and heathen soothsaying, by *μαντεύομαι, μάντις, μαντεία.* It is highly probable that the Alexandrian translators were influenced in their choice of these expressions by the distinction which existed between them in their *narrower* use. According to this, the *μάντις* was the ecstatic utterer of an oracle, the *προφήτης* the sober-minded interpreter of the oracle of the former, as Plato states in the chief passage on this subject in the *Timæus* (ed. Steph. p. 71 sq.) (1). Thus at Delphi, the interpreter of the Pythia, who combined the sounds she gave vent to into a sentence, was called *προφήτης* (Herodot. viii. 36; Plutarch, *de defectu orac.* cap. 51). When, then, the Old Testament Nabi is designated by the name *προφήτης*, he may be said to be chiefly characterized not as a *predicter* (a meaning belonging indeed also to *προφήτης*), but as an exponent of what the Divine Spirit has imparted to him, to which function it is essential that it should be consciously and intelligently performed. Philo's view of prophecy is at variance with this, and rather harmonizes, in the manner in which it describes the prophetic state, with what Plato (comp. also *Phædrus*, p. 265; *Jon.* p. 534, ed. Steph.) teaches concerning the mantic enthusiasm. It remodels, however, according to Old Testament supernaturalism, the Platonic theory, which regards the divining power of the soul as immanent in virtue of its Divine origin. The prophet is, according to Philo, the interpreter (*ἑρμηνεύς*) of God, who makes him inwardly perceive what he is to speak (*de praem. et poen.* Mang. ii. p. 417). This Divine inspiration is received by the prophet in a state of *ἔκστασις*, which is said indeed to be distinctly different from the frenzy of madness, but in which self-consciousness is nevertheless entirely in abeyance (comp. especially in the work, *Quis rerum divin. hæres sit*, the passage i. p. 511): the *νοῦς* has departed to give place to

Digitized by Google

the Divine Spirit (for if the Divine light is to rise, the human light must set). It is merely in appearance, says Philo, that the prophet himself speaks: he is in truth passive; another is making use of his organs of speech to announce His will. How far Philo severed the prophetic revelation from the life of the prophet, and regarded it as introduced therein without any predisposing cause, is shown particularly by the close of the first book *de monarchia* (2). But, on the other hand, Philo recognises no specific difference between prophecy and the Divine illumination imparted to every sage. In both, the same πνεῦμα is working. The prophetic state is at last nothing more in his view than that intuitive sinking of the *ego* in the Divine which, and therefore prophecy, is possible, παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀστείῳ (3).

Philo's view of the ecstatic character of the prophetic state was transferred to the *teaching of the earliest Christians*. The prophet, says Athenagoras (*Πρεσβεία*, cap. viii.), spake κατ' ἔκστασιν τῷ νὲν αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν, during which the Divine Spirit that moved them used them, as a flute-player does his instrument. In like manner Justin Martyr declares (*Cohort. ad Græcos*, cap. 8), that "men could not by nature nor by their own reflection know things so great and glorious, but only in virtue of the gift which then descended from on high upon these holy ones; they needed no arts of rhetoric, ... but only to yield themselves up in sincerity to the Divine Spirit, that He, as a Divine plectrum, descending from heaven, and using these righteous men like a cither or lute, might reveal to us the knowledge of Divine and heavenly things." It may indeed be disputed whether such rhetorical expressions are to be understood of the ecstasy in the strictest sense of the word, —the *amentia*, as Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* iv. 22), from his Montanist point of view, conceives of it. This subject was not more precisely discussed until it became, as Tertullian (*id.*) intimates, a matter of dispute between Montanists and Catholics. The latter, disgusted with the ecstasy as presented to them by the

Digitized by Google

Montanist prophets, declared all convulsions which repressed the rational consciousness unworthy of true prophecy, and only suitable to the manticism produced by demoniacal powers (4). Origen, in particular, most emphatically maintains the tenet that, during the influence of the Holy Spirit experienced by the prophets, the will and judgment remain in their normal activity, and that the removal of every obscuration of the understanding is a token that a better spirit is animating the soul (*de princip.* iii. 3, 4, comp. with Hom. vi. on Ezekiel). With this agree the declarations of Epiphanius against the Montanists (*Hær.* xlviii. 2 and 4 sqq.), and of Chrysostom, 29th Homily on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (5). Jerome, too, frequently speaks on this subject; see *Prol. in expos. Jes.* ed. Vallarsius, iv. sec. 3; *præf. comm. in Hab.* vi. p. 590, etc.; *præf. comm. in Nah.* vi. p. 536. Still the polemics of the Fathers, as Tholuck justly remarks (*Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*), do not deny the existence of *every kind* of ecstasy in the case of the organs of revelation. They could not thus set themselves in opposition to the clear statements of Holy Scripture. They only reject, as a reference to the words of Miltiades in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, *vide* p. 17, shows, the *παρέκστασις*, the state in which the man falls into the *ἀκούσιος μανία*, which they find to be, as Jerome especially insists, opposed to the saying of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 32, that the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets, who thus have prediction in their power; but admit that a *θεῖος μετεωρισμός* takes place with the prophets (Origenes, *in Johann.* ii. 1). Or, to use the expressions of Augustine, they reject the ecstasy as *alienatio a mente*, but acknowledge it as *alienatio mentis a sensibus corporis* (6). And this is in effect to regard the prophetic state as extraordinary and temporary. Frail human nature could not, as Jerome in his commentary on Ezekiel, lib. xi. on ch. xxxv. (*vide* p. 415), remarks, endure an uninterrupted state of revelation. In this respect we discern an essential difference between the prophets and Christ, in whom the Spirit abode permanently (7).

Digitized by Google

(1) Plato says, *id.*: *μαντικὴν ἀφροσύνῃ θεὸς ἀνθρωπίνῃ δέδωκεν· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔννους ἐφάπτεται μαντικῆς ἐνθέου καὶ ἀληθοῦς*, etc.; wherefore the *προφητῶν γένος* is given to the *μάντις* to explain and discern what the *μάντις* has spoken in enigmas.

(2) Moses, it is there said (Mang. ii. p. 222), excluded all kinds of heathen manticism; but in order that the innate desire of all men for the knowledge of the future might find its satisfaction, *ἐπιφανεὶς ἐξαπιναίως προφήτης θεοφόρητος θεσπιεῖ καὶ προφητεύσει, λέγων μὲν οἰκεῖον οὐδέν. οὐδὲ γάρ, εἰ λέγει, δύναται καταλαβεῖν ὃ γε κατεχόμενος ὄντως καὶ ἐνθουσιῶν· ὅσα δὲ ἐνηχεῖται διελεύσεται καθάπερ ὑποβάλλοντος ἑτέρου. ἑρμηνεῖς γάρ εἰσιν οἱ προφῆται θεοῦ καταχρωμένου τοῖς ἐκείνων ὀργάνοις πρὸς δήλωσιν ὧν ἂν ἐθελήσῃ.*

(3) Comp. *Quis rer. div. hær. s.*, p. 510: *Καὶ παντὶ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀστείῳ ὁ ἱερὸς λόγος προφητείαν μαρτυρεῖ . . . Φαύλῳ δὲ οὐ θέμις ἑρμηνεῖ γενέσθαι θεοῦ, ὥστε κυρίως μοχθηρὸς οὐδεὶς ἐνθουσιᾷ, μόνῳ δὲ σοφῷ ταῦτ' ἐφαρμόττει, ἐπεὶ καὶ μόνος ὄργανον θεοῦ ἐστιν ἠχοῦν, κρουόμενον καὶ πληττόμενον ἀοράτως ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Πάντας γοῦν ὁπόσους ἀνέγραψε δικαίους, κατεχομένους καὶ προφητεύοντας εἰσήγαγε.* Comp. also *de creat. principum*, ii. p. 368. The prophet, says Philo, has within him a strong sun for the clear perception of that which is invisible to the senses, but comprehensible to the intellect.

(4) The Clementine Homilies, however, in which this contrast first appears, go so far (iii. 12 sqq.) as to reject every transient state of inspiration, and say that this is the case with those only who are cast into a state of enthusiastic frenzy by the spirit of disorder, while they claim for the true prophet an immanent spiritual principle (*ἔμφυτον καὶ ἀένναον πνεῦμα*).

(5) In the latter passage it is said: *τοῦτο μάντεως ἴδιον, τὸ ἐξεστηκέναι, τὸ ἀνάγκην ὑπομένειν, τὸ ὠθεῖσθαι, τὸ ἕλκεσθαι, τὸ σύρεσθαι ὥσπερ μαινόμενον. Ὁ δὲ προφήτης οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ μετὰ διανοίας νηφούσης καὶ σωφρονούσης καταστάσεως, καὶ εἰδὼς ἃ φθέγγεται, φησὶν ἅπαντα· ὥστε καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐκβάσεως κάντεῦθεν γνώριζε τὸν μάντιν καὶ τὸν προφήτην.*

(6) Compare Augustine, *ad Simplicianum*, ii. q. i.; *Enarr.* in Ps. lxviii.; *de genesi*, xii. 25. In the last-named passage this ecstasy is thus described: *quando penitus avertitur et abripitur animi intentio a sensibus corporis, tunc magis ecstasis dici solet. Tunc omnino, quæcunque sint præsentia corpora, etiam patenti-*

Digitized by Google

bus oculis non videntur, nec ullæ voces prorsus audiuntur: totus animi contuitus aut in corporum imaginibus est per spiritalem, aut in rebus incorporeis, nulla corporis imagine figuratis, per intellectualem visionem.

(7) Comp. also lib. x. cap. 33 (p. 394): *si* semper *in prophetis esset sermo Dei et* juge *in pectore eorum haberet hospitium, nunquam tam crebro Ezechiel poneret: et factus est sermo domini ad me dicens.* The anti-Montanist definitions were also embraced by the catholic theology of the *subsequent centuries.* Compare, *e.g.*, how Gregory the Great (*Expositio moral. on Job*, ch. xiii.) expresses himself on the subject: *cum aliquid ostenditur vel auditur, si intellectus non tribuitur, prophetia minime est.* Pharaoh, *e.g.* (Gen. xli.), and Belshazzar (Dan. v.), had visions of things to come, but, being unable to understand them, were no prophets. We first meet with a more thorough discussion of the matter among the *Rabbinists of the middle ages*, especially Maimonides, *More Neboch.* ii. 32 sqq. (comp. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vi. p. 370). He distinguishes three views on prophecy. According to the first and usual one, God of His own free choice calls prophets without regard to their subjective qualifications, with the sole exception that only a just man can become a prophet. According to the second, the view of the philosophers, prophecy is a certain degree of perfection in the nature of man, depending upon special talents, but needing to be developed by diligent cultivation. Hence any one possessing the requisite talents may fit himself for a prophet; while, on the other hand, none can become a prophet without cultivation, nor can prophecy appear unexpectedly, as though one might attain to it the night before. Lastly, the third view, which Maimonides designates as that "of our law," agrees with the second in requiring a natural talent for prophecy, and especially those strong imaginative powers which are combined with a particular kind of cerebral organization. Hence, if the imaginative faculty is weakened by human sorrow or weariness, no prophecy can be produced. Thus in this view also it is admitted that any one possessing the requisite qualifications may fit himself both morally, by the purification of his desires and affections, and intellectually to be a recipient of the gift of prophecy. But it is denied that prophecy can be actually thus produced, as is shown by the example of

Digitized by Google

Baruch, the disciple of Jeremiah; on the contrary, it is God alone who produces it, how and when He will, in the individual thus qualified. The distinction of degrees of prophecy, subsequently adopted by other Rabbinists, especially by Abrabanel, is also peculiar to Maimonides. He affirms that there are eleven (ch. xlv.). The two first, which form the preliminary stages of prophecy proper, the endowment with the Spirit imparted to the judges, and the inspiration by the Holy Ghost bestowed upon the composers of the Hagiographa; this inspiration taking place in the waking state, and in one of full mental activity. On the other hand, the Divine word always comes to the prophets as such through the medium of the dream or vision, by which God exerts an influence upon the imagination and intelligence of the prophet, and fills both with matter which he could not have attained to in an ordinary manner (see especially cap. 38). It was only to Moses that Divine revelation was vouchsafed without the intervention of the imaginative powers. The external agency of the senses ceases during the prophetic state (cap. 41); but Maimonides so little speaks of a disappearance of the rational self-consciousness, that he, on the contrary, too much enhances the intellectual agency of the prophet. (The distinction of the nine degrees of prophecy proper is so unprofitable, that it need be no further noticed.)

§ 208.

Continuation: Phase of this Subject under Protestant Theology.

The propositions laid down by the Fathers, in opposition to the Montanists, were repeated by older Protestant theology (1). The occurrence of the ecstasy, in the sense in which Augustine defined it, was admitted, but it was regarded not as a constituent element of prophecy, but only as a preparation of the mind for the reception of revelation. The prevailing theory of inspiration being applied to prophecy, Protestant theologians assumed, in the case of prophets, both an entire passivity in the

Digitized by Google

reception of revelation, and a continued state of rational consciousness, with at most but momentary intermissions (2).

In proportion, however, as the orthodox notion of inspiration became unsettled, more influence over the form of their predictions was of course conceded to the subjectivity of the prophets. This was already done by Crusius in his *Hypomnemata ad theologiam propheticam*, 1764, i., in which he submits this subject to a thorough investigation. He chiefly insists upon the distinction between the matter of revelation and the form under which it is presented; and with respect to the latter, admits the intervention of the free agency of the organs of revelation, which makes them not *instrumenta Dei passiva*, but *activa*, as *σύνεργοι τοῦ Θεοῦ*. With respect, moreover, to the inspiration of the matter, Crusius distinguishes between *ἀποκάλυψις* in the narrower sense, which produces new knowledge in man either by a creative action or by a transformation of the knowledge already existing, and *φωτισμός*, the illumination which excites and strengthens the knowledge already existing (p. 93 sq.). The distinction between apostolic and prophetic inspiration is also well brought out by Crusius (p. 94 sq.). The inspiration of the apostles was uninterrupted, and, depending on the continued operation of Christ and of the Holy Spirit in them, made them more like Christ: hence they did not, except in certain cases, like 1 Cor. vii. 10, make use of the formula, "Thus saith the Lord." The repeated use of this formula, on the other hand, by the prophets, shows that the state of inspiration was in their case an extraordinary one. Still, even in Crusius, we meet with no exact psychological analysis of the prophetic state; and such discussions are still more foreign to the theology now prevailing, whether supernaturalistic (3) or rationalistic. In the latter, which at best sees in the prophets only men of its tendency, any inquiry into the nature of the prophetic state was entirely omitted. The visions which the prophets affirmed themselves to have beheld, were either attributed in a general manner to the poetic garment in

Digitized by Google

which they spontaneously clothed prophetic truths, or, if recognised in a certain sense as facts, were referred to a state of violent mental excitement. Prophecy in its stricter signification was regarded as out of the question; so that it was a considerable step in advance when De Wette (in the preface to the first edition of his *Introduction to the Old Testament*) declared, that it was a one-sided proceeding to judge these ancient seers according to the spirit of our times, and not even to admit that they *attempted to prophesy*. He was even so fair as to concede that the prophets had *genuine presentiments* of the future. The question under our notice received, however, a powerful impetus, when Hengstenberg (*Christologie des A. T.* 1st ed. p. 293 sqq.) revived in all its rigid one-sidedness the Montanist theory of prophecy (4). For he laid down the proposition (p. 294) that the prophets, when recipients of revelation, were in an extraordinary condition characteristically differing from their usual state—in an ἔκστασις, *in which the intelligent consciousness retreated, and the spontaneity, being suppressed by a powerful operation of the Divine Spirit, was reduced to a state of passivity*. They were then, however, truly exalted to a higher region (p. 297 sq.), because not only the intelligent consciousness but also the lower psychical life retreated, and they were thus fitted to receive, like an unsullied mirror, impressions of Divine truth. In the case of heathen seers, on the other hand, the suppression of the intelligent consciousness was effected by exciting the lower portion of the soul to contend against the higher. (We shall commence our further discussion of this subject by criticising this theory.)

(1) See *e.g.* Carpzov, *Introd. V. T.* p. 36 sq., and on what follows, p. 24.

(2) See also Buddeus, *Institut. theol. dogm.* p. 82, and the almost literally identical remark of Cotta on Gerhard's *Loci*, p. 21; Vitringa, *Typus doctrinæ propheticæ*, p. 18. Witsius, in his treatise *de prophetis et prophetia* (printed in the *Miscell. sacr.* 1), gives a somewhat closer investigation of the questions involved.

Digitized by Google

He here (cap. 8) opposes those who make prophecy the result of natural disposition, viz. of a very vivid imagination (so especially Spinoza in the *Tract. theol. polit.* p. 98 sqq. ed. Gfrörer), of a melancholy temperament, natural foresight, intellectual penetration, etc., and affirms that the freeness of that Divine grace from which the prophets received their vocation was unrestricted, and least of all confined to elevated minds. The *revelatio prophetica* itself is on the one hand *simplex, solo interno spiritus instinctu peracta*, on the other *symbolica* (cap. 3, § 1); the latter being occasioned partly by the external senses, partly by the imagination (§ 3). In the latter case, *spiritus animales per voluntatem Dei ita agitantur in cerebro et cerebrum eo modo afficiunt, quo modo externa objecta illud commovissent*, which may take place both in the waking and sleeping states. The ecstasy is reckoned among these, and defined (cap. 4, § 1) as *tanta mentis alienatio, ut, cessantibus externorum sensuum functionibus, ipsa eorum quæ in corpore geruntur prorsus ignara, tota vehementibus fixisque cogitationibus occupata sit.*

(3) Supernaturalism occupies itself with Old Testament prophecy chiefly for the sake of making use of the evidence of prophecy in the apologetic interest.

(4) In the 2d ed. iii. 2, p. 158 sqq., the earlier view is essentially modified.

§ 209.

Continuation: Continuity and Elevation of the Individual Life in the Prophetic State.

In Hengstenberg's former theory, truth and error were blended. It is true that in prophecy states do occur in which the individual life is subjugated by the power of the Divine Spirit, but it is not true that these coincide with the state of prophetic revelation, nay, that they are even essential thereto. The states of ecstasy which took place at the school of the prophets at Ramah, one of which is described 1 Sam. xix. 24 (1),

Digitized by Google

have already been alluded to in the historical section (§ 162). It may be that the designation of the prophets as mad (מְשֻׁגָּעִים), recurring in different passages (2 Kings ix. 11; Hos. ix. 7; Jer. xxix. 26), referred not merely to the matter of their addresses, but to some such state (2). Still such phenomena cannot be regarded as normal in prophecy, as is shown even by the passages to which Hengstenberg chiefly appeals, and which plainly show that self-consciousness and spontaneity did not disappear during the reception of revelation; that the prophets were indeed at this moment determined objectively by the Divine word which came to them, but by reason of the continuance of their self-consciousness were conscious of this objective determination, and were capable of free choice with respect to the Divine call addressed to them. In short, they were in a state of passive receptivity. Thus Isaiah, in his initiatory vision, which he describes ch. vi., is indeed conscious that he is a sinful man; he is also conscious that his iniquity is taken away and his sin purged, and declares himself ready in consequence to undertake the Divine commission. Jeremiah, too, in his inaugural vision, ch. i., was conscious of his own nonage and weakness (ver. 6); and if he did not resist the overwhelming pressure of the Divine call, nor refuse to fulfil, even amidst contempt and persecution, the vocation imposed upon him, this yielding on his part, however hard God might have made it to him to kick against the pricks, still rested in its deepest reasons upon a moral determination (3). It is true that Ezekiel, when he received the vision, ch. i., fell down overpowered by the sight (ver. 28), but he had to stand up again, ii. 1 sqq., to receive the revelation, and that (ver. 2) in the power of the Spirit who entered into him; and he then, evidently with complete consciousness, received the Divine word. It is true also that Daniel sank down stunned in consequence of a vision (x. 8–10), but he did not receive the revelation till he had recovered himself (comp. also Rev. i. 17). The continuity of self-consciousness presupposes that the remembrance of the

Digitized by Google

revelations they received in these visions remained with the prophets, and that they themselves, and not others, described what they had seen (so *e.g.* Zech. i. sqq.). It is this circumstance, to mention it in passing, which makes so decided a distinction between prophecy and those psychical phenomena with which it has been so often compared, viz. somnambulism and the higher grades of mantic ecstasy, such *e.g.* as still occur in Shamanism (4), when there is upon awakening no remembrance of what has been uttered. Besides, whatever harm the visionary state may do to the physical life in the case even of true prophets, as Daniel *e.g.* says, viii. 27, that he was sick several days in consequence of a vision, this cannot be designated as a *suppression* of the individual life. On the contrary, the prophet felt himself inwardly *elevated*. Isaiah (ch. viii. 11 sqq.), when under the pressure of the Divine hand (חֲזָקַת הַיָּד, by which the visionary state is intended), knew himself to be under Divine instruction, which no longer suffered him to walk in the way of the multitude; Jeremiah, though he feared, naturally speaking, to fail before his enemies, yet knew that he should prevail over them all through the power of the Spirit, i. 19, xv. 20, xx. 11; comp. Hab. iii. 19, etc. (5). In thus showing, however, that the individual life is not obliterated but enhanced in the prophetic state, we have still left the question, *what the psychical form of prophecy properly is*, without an answer.

(1) According to 1 Sam. xix. 24, Saul, when seized by the spirit of prophecy in the school of the prophets, stripped off his clothes also (גַּם הוּא, therefore like the prophets), and prophesied, and lay down naked all that day and all that night,—a circumstance which recalls to mind the Delphian Pythia, who in her ecstasy stripped herself of her garments.

(2) This climax of the ecstatic state, in which self-consciousness disappears, seems to belong especially to the older times of the prophethood (§ 162, with note 5).

(3) Thus too does Amos, who lays such special stress upon the Divine initiative, refer the prophetic vocation, iii. 3, to an agreement between God and the prophet.

Digitized by Google

(4) We are acquainted with the latter especially from the travels of Herr. v. Matjuschkin; comp. *e.g.* Tholuck, *id.* p. 8 sqq.

(5) According to Hab. iii. 19, the prophet walks triumphantly upon the high places on which God has placed him. Comp. also 1 Sam. x. 6, 9, and what was stated, § 161, on the ethical influence of the prophetic spirit.

§ 210.

Continuation: Prophecy an Inward Intuition.

Those who endeavour to explain the prophetic state in a *natural* and psychologic manner, are accustomed to regard it as produced by a considerable excitement and exaltation of the emotions. This is so far correct, that this state is preceded by one of strong excitement of the feelings; nay, that the latter may often be intentionally produced as a preparation for the former, for which purpose music is especially employed, 2 Kings iii. 15 (1). To this may also be referred the circumstance alluded to by Hengstenberg (*Christologie*, 2d ed. iii. 2, p. 163), that the prophets sometimes (comp. Ezek. i. 3, Dan. x. 4) received their visions by the sides of rivers, because the murmur of the waters could not but assist in producing in them the desired state of mind. But that feeling constitutes the essential form of the prophetic state, is refuted, as Bruno Bauer justly remarks (*Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, ii. p. 306), by the fact that in feeling, the matter felt is not yet separated from the subjective spirit, while the matter upon which the prophetic spirit operates is objectively given outside itself. Undoubtedly the prophets were often in a state of excited feeling at the times when they uttered their predictions, and did not, as merely mechanical instruments of the inspiring Spirit, comport themselves in an utterly uninterested manner with respect to their prophecies. They were stirred by fear and hope, filled with sorrow and joy, and this as

Digitized by Google

intensely as if the matter they predicted were the subject of their own experience. But that in such cases the frame of mind was of secondary importance, that it was produced by the objective influence of the Divine Spirit, is evident especially from the circumstance that the feeling natural to the prophet was frequently exchanged for just its opposite. Thus the emotion natural to a prophet when announcing judgments against the enemies of his country is evidently that of joy. Nevertheless passages are found in which the prophet is so carried away by his own vivid realization of the woes which he announces, as to be full of sorrow and lamentation. Comp. the prophecy concerning Moab, Isa. xvi. 9–11 (2), and that concerning Babylon, xxi. 1–10, where this state of mind is very distinctly portrayed. In the vision, which is described ver. 2 as a grievous one, the prophet beholds the Medo-Persian hosts advancing against Babylon, and is immediately plunged into the gloom in which Babylon is sinking. His natural feeling as an Israelite would have been one of joy at the deliverance of his people, to whose sorrows an end was thus appointed; yet the revelation he has received has so overpowering an effect upon his feelings, that he feels the sorrows about to fall upon Babylon just as though they were his own, ver. 3 sq. (3). On the other hand, the feeling natural to the prophet must exercise no influence upon his predictions; comp. *e.g.* Jer. xvii. 16 (§ 206, note 2). Even when the prophet knows himself to be the bearer of the Divine wrath, even such a message from God must be relished by him, see Ezek. iii. 1 sqq. compared with ii. 10, iii. 14, Rev. x. 9 sq., and received within him to become his joy and delight.

The psychical form of prophecy is rather that of an *inward intuition*, taking the word in its wider signification. It belongs to external perception that the subject is aware that the object is directly given, and not produced by his own agency; and this is just what the prophets affirm with respect to their prophecies. Hence the prophets designate themselves as *seers*, רֹאֶה, which,

Digitized by Google

according to 1 Sam. ix. 9, was the former customary appellation of prophets, and more frequently חֹזֶה. See Isa. xxx. 10, and many other passages, especially in the Books of Chronicles. Often as the attempt has been made, no decided difference can be shown between the expressions רֹאֶה and חֹזֶה, so far as they are used to designate the prophetic perception (4). חָזָה, which in Hebrew though not in Chaldee belongs rather to poetic diction, is used as a somewhat more solemn expression; חָזוּת, חָזָיוֹן, and especially חָזוֹן, are the frequently recurring appellations of the revelations imparted to the prophets. Sometimes this inward perception of the prophets is also designated a *hearing*, *e.g.* Num. xxiv. 4, 16, Isa. xxi. 10 (5), xxviii. 22, with which compare also v. 9, xxii. 14. In l. 4, on the contrary, the words, "He wakeneth morning by morning, He wakeneth mine ear to hear as the instructed" (*i.e.* takes me to His school), refer not so much to the reception of revealed knowledge as to the Lord's supplying His servant with grace to walk with patient obedience in the path prescribed to him. The prophets, however, chiefly choose the expression *to see*, even when it is a mere form of speech, for the manner in which they became directly conscious of the God-given matter (6); see *e.g.* Amos i. 1 (7), Isa. ii. 1, Hab. i. 1, and especially ii. 1 (see below). There is also a reference to this form of prophecy in the designations of עַיִן, מְצַפִּים, *i.e.* spies, or שֹׁמְרִים, watchmen, though the latter name has also a wider signification (§ 162). As the watchman upon the tower keeps a look-out for anything that may appear in the distance, and when he sees danger approaching sounds his horn, so do the prophets behold the events dawning upon the distant horizon of time, that by announcing them they may warn or comfort the people, who are ignorant of the future; see Jer. vi. 17 (8), Amos iii. 6, Isa. lii. 8, Ezek. xxxiii. 2 sqq. Hence, too, they are called, Isa. xxix. 10, the eyes of the people. Specially instructive in this respect is the passage Hab. ii. 1. The prophet's mind is agitated by the conflict with doubt, he is longing for light upon the enigmas of time, and exclaims: "I

Digitized by Google

will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what He will say within me, and what I bring back upon my reproof." This passage may be taken literally (as by Hitzig), viz. as saying that the prophet sought a solitary place, where, directing his glance towards heaven and his collected spirit to God, he looked for revelation. Probably, however, this prophetic saying is to be spiritually understood, as is indispensably necessary in the similar passage, Isa. xxi. 6, 8. The latter passage is also worthy of note, for the distinction it makes between the seeing spirit of the prophet and his ordinary subjectivity, which sets another as watchman upon the tower, to declare what the Lord causes him to see, and what is to be announced to the people. In ver. 11 sq. of the same chapter, on the other hand, the prophet himself reappears as watchman. What the prophet now perceives is a דְּבַר יְהוָה (word of the Lord), a נְאֻם יְהוָה (which expression represents the mysterious nature of the inwardly perceived Divine voice), a מַשָּׂא (a lofty or eminent saying) (9), etc. Such *words* of revelation fall, according to what was remarked above, under the notion of the חָזוֹן in its wider sense. When, however, the image awakened by the revelation appears in a plastic form before the mind of the prophet, a *vision* in the stricter sense takes place, and this is of a symbolical character, the matter of the prophecy being reflected in the imagination of the prophet (10). With respect to *visionary symbolism*, there is a remarkable difference between individual prophets. In some, especially the more ancient, it is simple, and therefore for the most part easily understood, *e.g.* the visions of Amos, ch. vii. sqq. (11). In Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Daniel, on the contrary, the symbolism is more complicated; and cases occur in which the prophet himself does not understand the images he beholds, and requests an explanation of them (Zech. iv. 4, Dan. viii. 15). The prophets are, moreover, frequently required to impress the matter of the Divine messages by symbolical *actions*. In many of these cases, however (especially in Ezekiel), it may be questioned whether the action

Digitized by Google

really took place externally, as *e.g.* Isa. xx. 2, or whether it belongs merely to the vision (12).

(1) According to 2 Kings iii. 15, Elisha, to bring himself into the right frame of mind for the reception of revelation, sends for a minstrel, and while he is touching the strings the hand of the Lord comes upon the prophet. Comp. also § 162 and note 7 in the historical section.

(2) Isa. xvi. 9–11, the prophet laments, as if he were himself a Moabite, over the desolation of the land of Moab; his heart sounds like a harp for the affliction which he has to proclaim.

(3) Isa. xxi. 3 sq.: "My loins are filled with pain: pangs have taken hold of me, as the pangs of a woman that travaileth: I was bowed at the hearing of it; I was dismayed at the saying of it: my heart panted, fearfulness affrighted me: the night of my pleasures hath He turned into fear to me."

(4) Not even by the distinction maintained by Vitringa, that רָאָה is the general expression, while חָזָה, on the contrary, more denotes the ecstatic seeing.

(5) Isa. xxi. 10: "That which I have heard of the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, have I declared unto you."

(6) Which Augustine, *de genesi*, xii. 25, calls in the above-quoted passage the *intellectualis visio*, in distinction from the *spiritalis*.

(7) Amos i. 1: "The words of Amos, . . . which he *saw*."

(8) Jer. vi. 17: "I have set watchmen over you, Hearken to the sound of the trumpet."

(9) It is quite a mistake, and by no means follows from the play upon the word, Jer. xxiii. 33 sqq., to say that the word מַשָּׂא in the titles of the prophecies means, as Hengstenberg tries to prove (*Christologie*, ii. sec. 3, p. 337 sqq.), "burden," and introduces only threatening addresses. The passage Lam. ii. 14, where the sayings of the false prophets who flattered the people are called מַשְׂאוֹת שָׁוְא, is decisive against this view, notwithstanding the turn which Hengstenberg manages to give it. There is in the expression מַשָּׂא (properly that which is raised above) a certain emphasis, and this circumstance explains why it is so often applied to addresses which pronounce penalties.

Digitized by Google

(10) There is, as Tholuck justly remarks (*id.* p. 54), no distinction of degree and time between the two forms of revelation, viz. those of word and image; it is rather the individual idiosyncrasy of the prophet which here seems to exert its influence.

(11) Amos vii., the devouring locusts and the consuming fire, as images of the Divine judgments, the plumb-line laid to the wall as symbolical of the dealings of the Divine justice; ch. viii., the basket of ripe fruit as an image of the nation ripe for judgment.

(12) There is scarcely a point in prophetic theology concerning which theologians so greatly differ. Comp. the marriage of Hosea, which Hengstenberg affirms to be a purely visionary occurrence. No general principle can be laid down by which to determine how far such actions pertain to the province of the external or the internal. (Comp. Tholuck, *id.* p. 60; Bleek, *Einleitung in das A. T.* p. 426.)

§ 211.

The Prophetic State illustrated by Analogies in the Ordinary Life of the Spirit: Dreams, Communion with God in Prayer.

If we seek for analogous occurrences in the ordinary life of the human spirit, to cast some light on the nature of prophetic sight or perception, the first which seems to offer itself for comparison is the vivid dream, in which the self-consciousness which had withdrawn during sleep again dawns and thus fastens in the memory the images seen in the dreams. That the Old Testament does not exclude the dream (1) as a medium of revelation, was shown § 66, where, however, it was also remarked that the Old Testament speaks of dream-revelations almost solely in the cases of such as were not, strictly speaking, organs of revelation. In Jer. xxiii. 25, comp. with Deut. xiii. 2 sqq., and Zech. x. 2 sqq., it is laid down as a token of the false prophets that they chiefly appealed to dreams; and Jeremiah opposes to these the revelations imparted to himself, xxiii. 28

Digitized by Google

(see § 66, note 3) Hence it is all the less probable that in the difficult and ambiguous passage xxxi. 26 he is himself, as many suppose, referring to a revelation by means of a dream. Nor are the night visions of Zechariah, ch. i.–vi., to be regarded as ordinary dreams. Ch. iv. 1, which tells us that the prophet was awakened for the reception of the vision (2), shows that his visionary state was not one of dreaming. In Daniel (vii. 1), the revelation advances from the dream to the higher vision. The reason why only a subordinate importance is attributed to dreams, is easy to perceive. Although sleep, by reason of its withdrawal of a man from the external world, seems specially favourable for the intercourse of the Divine with the human spirit; still, on the other hand, a man in this condition is not duly capable of distinguishing between what proceeds from his own heart (חֲזוֹן לֵב, Jer. xxiii. 16) and Divine inspiration. The Divine word, on the contrary, must come to the prophets in such a manner as to leave them in no kind of doubt that it is such. It is true that among the conditions with which the vision is combined there is found also a *sleep*, which outwardly appears to be a state of deep insensibility, תַּרְדֵּמָה, נִרְדָּם, Dan. viii. 18, x. 9. The seer sinks down, his external eyes closed, while his internal eyes are opened, Num. xxiv. 4, 15. The visionary state is sometimes enhanced even to rapture, Ezek. viii. 1–3, xi. 1. There is a rapture described by St. Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 2–4, which, to use the words of Delitzsch (*Biblische Psychologie*, 2d ed. p. 285), touches the boundaries of life and death, *i.e.* of the separation of soul and body (3). But *in by far the greater number of cases* we must evidently conceive of the state in which the prophet receives a revelation as merely one of *profound self-introversion and collectedness of mind in a state of perfect wakefulness*. This prophetic state is most nearly related to *communion with God in prayer*. It should be carefully noted that the same expression which is generally used in the Old Testament for the hearing of prayer, viz. that God *answers*, עָנָה, is also frequently applied to prophetic revelation (*e.g.* in Mic.

Digitized by Google

iii. 7, Hab. ii. 1 sq., Jer. xxiii. 35, and other passages). When suddenly, at once, and with full certainty, the conviction of the Divine audience enters the soul of the petitioner as an inwardly perceived answer (4), such a conviction is entirely analogous to the manner in which the word of God came to the prophets; and hence we find that many supplicatory psalms conclude in a strain quite prophetic. And as the Divine answer presupposes a request on the part of the petitioner, so also do we find the prophets in certain cases bringing before God in prayer the matters concerning which they desire Divine revelation (Jer. xxxii. 16, xlii. 4, Hab. i., Dan. ix. 4 sqq.); nay, in Jer. xxxiii. 2, *calling* upon God is the presupposed condition of obtaining revelation: "*Call unto* me, and I will answer thee, and show thee great and hidden things which thou knowest not." This point is particularly fitted to bring to light the *ethical* character of the prophet's relation to God. It is true that the God whose Spirit so pervades all things that every word uttered by a human tongue is before Him (Ps. cxxxix. 4, 7), may, according to Holy Scripture, constrain even a Balaam to predict blessings to Israel, reveal the future in dreams to a Nebuchadnezzar, employ (Ezek. xxi. 26 sq.) even forms of heathen manticism for His own purposes, and so direct the words of a Caiaphas, John xi. 51, as to make him prophesy without his own knowledge or will. But certain as it is that there is, as the examples just adduced show, a Divine influence in virtue of which a man must either say what he desires not to say, or voluntarily utter that to which a Divine meaning neither known nor intended by himself is imparted, still this does not justify us in ignoring the subjective medium of revelation furnished by the true prophets. For in the case of these organs of Divine revelation, properly so called, their self-surrender and their own acquiescence in the Divine counsels of which they were to be the messengers (5) corresponded, as has been already remarked (§ 209), with the Divine choice and calling. Thus there arose an understanding, a mutual intercourse between God and the prophet, in which

Digitized by Google

the latter gave his whole being, with its special qualifications, to the fulfilment of his office, and lived his whole life with reference thereto. Whatever the prophet learned, experienced, or observed, all that he feared or hoped, all concerning which he needed counsel or information, nay, even the external events which concerned him personally, see *e.g.* Hos. i., Ezek. xxiv. 18 sqq., offered so many points of connection by which the Divine word might reach him, and that word clothed itself in forms which had a relation to the idiosyncrasy and experience of the prophet, and was reported by him according to his individual rhetorical or literary powers. This word of God was, however, *by no means produced*, through any kind of moral or intellectual motive, from the matter of the prophet's subjectivity. "A man can receive nothing except it be given him from heaven," is the testimony of the greatest of the prophets (John iii. 27). An answer to prayer cannot be manufactured, but depends upon whether God will permit Himself to be met with or not (Isa. lv. 6, Ps. xxxii. 6, etc.); nay, there are even seasons when heaven seems closed against the wrestling in prayer of God's servants, and a prophet, too, might indeed prepare himself for the reception of a revelation, but could neither extort one nor prescribe its matter. Accordingly we find that the prophets often had to wait till they received the Divine communications, see Isa. xxi. 8, Jer. xlii. 7 in its connection with ver. 4; and that there were times (as remarked, § 206) in which such communications entirely ceased. The last-named point furnishes a proof of the very doubtful standing of the *natural explanation* of the prophetic state. Hecker the physiologist (*Ueber Visionen*, 1848, p. 11, 13) is of opinion that any vivid conception, whether true or imaginary, may, by reason of continued nervous excitement, be transformed into a vision so soon as it has attained the requisite fervour, and that it is in this way that the sublimest ideas have been incorporated in the religions of all nations. It must be remarked, however, that there was no lack either of sublime ideas or "fervour" in the

Digitized by Google

days described Lam. ii. 9, Ps. lxxiv. 9, etc., and in the times of the Maccabees (comp. § 192), and yet prophecy was then silent (6).

(1) Prophetic significance was, even in all heathen antiquity, attributed to dreams, upon the assumption that when the voluntary self-determination of man ceases, the Divine influence begins to operate upon his soul. If, during sleep, when that by which the inner life of man is governed and determined acts most unrestrainedly, the communion of the saints with God takes place in full efficacy (comp. especially Ps. xvi. 7), the soul will also, when in this condition, be in a state of special recipiency for the influence of the Divine Spirit (Job xxxiii. 14 sqq.).

(2) Zech. iv. 1: "As a man that is wakened out of his sleep." "The weakness of human nature," says Hengstenberg in his just remarks on this passage (*Christologie*, ii. sec. 3, p. 290), "had asserted in his case its incapacity to maintain for any lengthened period the contemplation of the super-sensuous" (comp. Luke ix. 32).

(3) A comparison of such visions with the phenomena of magnetic somnambulism is obvious; but the greater the external resemblance, the less must the essential difference between them, already alluded to § 209, be overlooked, viz. that the self-consciousness of the prophet is never lost in the vision; and that by virtue of this continuity of self-consciousness the state of revelation enters into active connection with the ordinary mental state of the prophet, and exercises a decided and lasting influence thereon. Comp. Ennemoser, *der Magnetismus im Verhältniss zur Natur und Religion*, pp. 91 and 241. In the latter passage the results of the comparison of prophetic with other psychical phenomena are summed up in the words, "Divine prophetic inspiration, from whatever point of view it may be critically regarded, is a unique phenomenon." Visions of the higher grade are, moreover, by no means frequent in the Old Testament.

(4) Comp. *e.g.* Ps. xx. 7: "Now *know I* that the Lord saveth His anointed."

(5) The ethic element in prophecy is maintained, though with one-sided prominence, against Hengstenberg and Hof-

Digitized by Google

mann by Düsterdieck, *de rei propheticæ in V. T. quum universæ tum messianæ natura ethica*, 1852.

(6) The last days of Jerusalem, before its destruction by the Romans, well showed what kind of prophets natural fervour is capable of breeding, § 192, note 10. It is only by acknowledging revelation as a spontaneous and actual relation into which God has entered with the world, that such revelationless periods can be possibly understood.

§ 212.

Continuation: The Conceptions of Genius and the Natural Powers of Divination.

In explaining Old Testament prophecy, the attempt has often been made to refer it to prophetic powers inherent in the human mind, and manifesting themselves also in the *conceptions of genius*, whether of the poet, the artist, the hero, etc., when—"at one time after long reflection and by gradual development, at another at once and apparently without preparation—some great thought comes before his soul with such vividness and power that in this moment of conception his creative mind already bears within it, in its fully completed state, the work on which he may perhaps still have to labour for years." (It is thus that E. Graf expresses himself concerning the several revelations of God, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1859, No. 2, p. 272. Comp. also Rothe, *zur Dogmatik*, 1st ed. p. 71, 2d ed. p. 70.) In particular has a *divining power*, inherent in the human mind, and producing actual prophecy outside the province of scriptural revelation, been spoken of. This has been done especially by E. v. Lasaulx, in his work *Die prophetische Kraft der menschlichen Seele in Dichtern und Denkern*, 1858 (1); while Hamann had already ventured to declare, "We are all capable of being prophets." For this theory a certain amount of truth must be acknowledged, even from a scriptural standpoint; for the Old Testa-

Digitized by Google

ment (as was shown, § 65) refers all intellectual endowment to a Divine spiritual influence on the mind. Still that personal and familiar relation in which the prophet stands to God, which makes him a participator of the Divine counsel, and discloses to him secret things, Amos iii. 7, Jer. xxiii. 18, etc. (comp. § 161), stands out as something specific amidst these general spiritual influences (2). With regard to so-called natural divination, in particular, the aspect in which this may most allowably be compared with scriptural prophecy is, that it is the *prophecy of conscience* (3). For as the God who gives testimony to Himself in the conscience pledges to it a holy and righteous government of the world, and thus sharpens in every morally susceptible man a perception of the providential leading whether of individuals or nations, is the same Being who reveals in prophecy the laws of His moral government, the two must necessarily coincide with each other in essentials (4). But does this natural divination know anything positively respecting the purposes of God's ways upon earth? Lasaulx may call Scipio's allusion, amidst the ruins of Carthage, to the future fall of Rome, in the words of Homer (*Iliad*, IV. v. 164 sq.), "a genuine prophecy;" but the prophets of the Old Testament knew something more, when they proclaimed that above the ruins of all earthly power the glory of the God of Israel should flow like the waves of the sea (Hab. ii. 13 sq.), when they beheld from their corner of the world the kingdom of God coming to all nations, and when Daniel declared (ch. vii.) that the kingdom of the Son of man from heaven should triumph over all those secular powers which should successively emerge from the storm-tossed ocean of the nations (5). Besides, how does the prophecy of conscience manage the enigmas given it to solve, by those contradictions of its postulates which are presented by the course of the world? (6). And when Lasaulx, in attempting to explain the prophecy of the Old Testament, further suggests the sympathetic connection of the individual human spirit with the national spirit and that of all

Digitized by Google

mankind, we fully concede that a nation may produce individuals in whom the presentiments of the national spirit may be transfigured into lucid thoughts, and, under certain circumstances, be even clearly expressed in prophetic sayings; but it is equally certain that the prophets of the Old Testament laid no claim to this honour. They knew that the Spirit by which they were inspired was not the natural spirit of their nation; that their predictions were not the expression of popular expectations. The power of Old Testament prophecy was so far from being occasioned by the secular prosperity of the nation, that it was, on the contrary, in proportion as the external glory of Israel decayed that prophecy unfurled her wings and proclaimed upon the grave of Israel's earthly hopes the triumph of the eternal kingdom of God (7). The prophets knew that the thoughts of God, of which they were the interpreters, are as high above the thoughts of man as heaven is higher than earth, Isa. lv. 8 sq. (8).

This transcendence of revelation extends so far as to become a *restraint* to prophecy: for, as the Old Testament knows nothing of any permanent *inherence* of the Spirit of revelation in the prophets, but speaks only of a falling (Ezek. xi. 5), a coming (1 Sam. x. 6) of the Spirit *upon* or *over* them; so the matter of revelation, though their free agency is manifested in the form in which they present it, is not, strictly speaking, the mental possession of the prophets, but continues to be a thing *imparted*. Hence its meaning was not exhausted by their understanding, but was, as St. Peter tells us, 1 Pet. i. 10, a matter of investigation to themselves (9). This accounts also for the impression, so often received by the attentive reader from the prophetic word, that it reaches further than its inadequate form, and bears within it, according to the intention of the Spirit, that which far surpasses the individual consciousness of the prophet (10).

(1) The result of this work is comprised in the following

Digitized by Google

sentence: "If there is present in every human soul somewhat of the collective powers of the soul of his nation and of the soul of all mankind, nay, of the soul of the world; and if, in the matter of prophesying, as in every great matter of human life, the individual soul is immersed in the universal soul, in the great and universal meaning of nature and the world, and is thence born again with renovated powers; it is conceivable that, as the present is as substantially connected with the future as it is with the past, each individual soul may foresee not only its own future, but also that of its nation, nay, of all mankind From the depths of the soul and from the creative power of God therein arise all great thoughts, all that is new or extraordinary, all that leads mankind towards its eternal destination."

(2) Therefore the prophet knows himself to be taught of God in quite another manner from that in which the artisan Bezaleel, *e.g.*, nay, even Solomon, could declare themselves to be.

(3) Comp. Beck, *Einleitung in das System der Christl. Lehre*, p. 197.

(4) The strength of this natural divination lies in its presentiment of approaching Divine judgments, in its perception that a curse cleaves to all unexpiated guilt, that all power founded on deceit and unrighteousness works its own destruction, and that all earthly glory and greatness is destined to perish.

(5) So far as natural divination points to a perfect realization of the ethic idea in human nature, it must either renounce all attempt of announcing the historical medium of such realization, or seek the historical point of connection within its own horizon; and the διαθῆκαι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (Eph. ii. 12) with which God has connected the historical development of His kingdom being outside of this horizon, it must necessarily make mistakes. Of the first kind are theories like Plato's delineation of the ideal of a just man, who, without having done anything wrong, appears to be unrighteous; who is chained, scourged, blinded, and at last even impaled (*Rep.* ii. p. 361); and of which Lasaulx (*id.* p. 23) says that he never in the sacred books of the Jews met with any more magnificent prophecy concerning the Lord's holy and righteous One. (Comp. also his work, *Des Sokrates Leben, Lehre und*

Digitized by Google

Tod, in which, p. 121, he ranks Socrates among the prophets.) Virgil is an example of the second kind, when in his celebrated 4th Eclogue he connects the return of the Golden Age with the consulate of Pollio and the birth of his son, and then in the *Æneid*, as is well known, sets up Augustus as the bringer in of a new age, but in both cases combines the *imperium sine fine* with Rome (*Æn.* i. ver. 278).

(6) What a struggle takes place in such cases between a belief in providence and the belief lurking behind the conscience that the world is governed by a fate for which there is no moral necessity! (See § 8, note 2.)

(7) This point is calculated to show the contrast between Old Testament revelation and heathen manticism. The religious importance of manticism, like the power of ancient heathenism in general, rises and falls with the national life. The power of oracles was ruined with that of Hellenistic nationality; and they were, as Plutarch testifies, no longer consulted on the more important occasions, but only on trifling matters, such as whether a marriage should be contracted, a voyage undertaken, whether corn and hay would yield well, etc.; which circumstance Plutarch adduces among others to explain why in his days the Pythia had ceased to give her answers in verses (*de Pyth. orac.* cap. 28, comp. with *de defectu orac.* cap. 7). But even for a Julian, Apollo had no longer an answer in readiness.

(8) Comp. also what has been already said, § 5, note 1, against the derivation of the Old Testament religion from the natural peculiarities of the Israelitish people.

(9) This relation of the subjectivity of the prophet to the revelation is so explained, from a Hegelian standpoint, that in the Old Testament the identity of the finite and the infinite subjectivity has not yet been infinitely brought to pass, but is only a direct one; which way of direct union did not suffer the two equally to attain their right, when they would have obliterated each other in the concrete spirituality (see Vatke, *die Religion des A. T.* p. 624 sq.). If, on the other hand, we put in the place of the logical process the historical development of revelation, as reported in Scripture, the result will be as stated § 204 in this respect.

(10) The importance of the propositions as yet developed

Digitized by Google

will appear in the discussion of the *nature of prophecy*, to which we now proceed.

SECOND SUBDIVISION.

OF PROPHECY.

§ 213.

Its Office in general.

According to the definition formerly usual, prophecy was said to be the prediction, by means of Divine revelation, of any occurrence which was *incidental*, and therefore not to be foreknown by human wisdom (1). This definition is in every respect inadequate. According to the passage in Deuteronomy, discussed §§ 97 and 161, prophecy is said to secure to the people that which heathenism in vain sought to furnish by its manticism. Now even *heathen manticism* would not be correctly appreciated if regarded merely as a means of inquiring into future incidental matters, and consequently as a means of satisfying human curiosity; that is to say, if its religious element is made to consist only in the supplementary assistance of the Deity in those matters for which human reason and wisdom are insufficient (2). Much rather does manticism originate in the inalienable craving of the human spirit to know itself in active communion and to maintain a constant intercourse with Deity, and in the belief that God has not forsaken men, but makes their actions and all that befalls them the object of His care, and will for this reason manifest Himself unto them. The object of manticism was to make known to man the will and counsel of God in all the important events of life; to give him information, especially at critical seasons, how to do what was right and pleasing to God (3). The word of prophecy afforded such an *interpretatio divinæ voluntatis* as heathenism in vain sought to furnish by its manticism. *How far, then*, it may be asked, *does the announcement of the Divine will made by prophecy ex-*

Digitized by Google

tend? That the prophets were applied to for disclosures even in *matters of ordinary life*, is shown by such narratives as 1 Sam. ix. 6 sqq. (4); 1 Kings xiv. 1 sqq.; 2 Kings i. 3, and the well-known occurrences in the history of Elisha. In the *first place*, however, the Old Testament strictly insists that they who on any occasion seek a prophetic answer from God must earnestly seek Him and walk in His ways (5). The chief passage on this subject is Ezek. xiv. 1–20, comp. with xx. 1–4. The prophet is not to be at the command of the elders of Israel, who inquire of the Lord with the mouth while they have set up their idols in their heart, but is rather to reprove their ungodliness. God will not be inquired of by a rebellious generation, because prophecy is not to be degraded into a toy of frivolous curiosity. In the *second place*, this condescension to the ordinary requirements of the people, which was to enable them to dispense with seeking counsel from heathen soothsayers (6), is an element kept quite in the background in prophecy (7). On the whole, prophecy was designed to educate the nation to a perception of what kind of knowledge of the future could alone be a blessing to man, by opening its eyes to the holy government of God in history and to the aims of Divine providence, that thus it might learn to prepare for coming judgments (comp. passages such as Amos iv. 12, etc.), and, walking in the light of its own calling to salvation, and of the great future which this involved, might regard it as beneath its dignity to yield to the impulse for soothsaying; comp. as chief passages, Isa. ii. 5 sq. in connection with vers. 1–4. If, then, we regard the collective contents of the prophetic books of the Old Testament, we must say that prophecy is employed entirely in promoting only *the interests of the kingdom of God*, and that its main office is to unfold its ways. In saying this, we have not, however, as yet answered the question whether prophecy as such is a *prediction* of individual occurrences, and if so, what are its characteristics, and how is it related to its fulfilment? (8).

Digitized by Google

(1) So *e.g.* Vitringa, *Typus doctrinæ propheticæ*, p. 2: "Prophetia *est prædictio casus aut eventus contingentis futuri temporis ex revelatione divina*," which thus excludes from prophecy all *eventus necessarii*, such as the succession of day and night, the ebb and flow of the tide, etc., and on the other hand designates *hominum volitiones et actiones liberæ, earumque consequentia*, as its *verum ac proprium objectum*,—a remarkable definition, according to which those Divine counsels which are independent of human freedom could not be the object of prophecy.

(2) This view of manticism is only suitable to the times of its decadence, when it had become with some, an empty form maintained only for political objects, with others, a superstition subserving only the most insignificant purposes of daily life, and estranged from all higher aims; and when even the Stoics, in their philosophical justification of manticism, only attempted to assert for it an essentially theoretical interest, viz. that it might in individual cases disclose to human perception that unchangeable causality of things which has its foundation in the eternal law of fate (see Wachsmuth, *die Ansichten der Stoiker über Mantik und Dämonen*, 1860, especially p. 22 sqq.).

(3) Man longs for the Divine consent, for the assurance of the Divine blessing, even when a resolution has been formed after mature deliberation; or, when threatening premonitions of Divine judgments appear, desires to learn from the Deity Himself the means of expiation, and of deliverance from the curse resting upon him.

(4) To be sure, the passage 1 Sam. ix. 6 sqq. leaves it uncertain whether Samuel would, under other circumstances, have given information concerning the lost asses. Still the parenthetical note ver. 9 is a proof that the prophets were accessible for such matters.

(5) Saul, after being rejected, obtained in his helpless condition no other answer from God than one of judgment, 1 Sam. xxviii. 6; so, too, the wife of Jeroboam, when consulting the prophet Ahijah concerning her sick child, received, besides the unwished-for disclosure, a stern rebuke, 1 Kings xiv. 6–16.

(6) Comp. Origen, *c. Cels.* i. 354; Redepenning, *Origen*, i. p. 287.

(7) We have herein, as H. Schultz (*Göttinger gel. Anz.* 1862,

Digitized by Google

p. 230) justly remarks, a testimony "how Divine revelation so sank itself into the natural soil of human manners and customs, as not on every occasion at once to refuse the inadequate, but to let it perish in virtue of its own vanity, in presence of the Divine."

(8) On the history of different views of prophecy, and the progress of its treatment in Patristic and Protestant theology, see the article quoted in Herzog, xvii. p. 644 sqq.

§ 214.

The Prediction of Particular Events an Essential Element of Prophecy.

According to the theory of some, the sole essential feature of prophecy is declared to be its expression of the general ideas of the Divine government; while its prediction of particular events is, on the other hand, to be regarded as comparatively unessential and subordinate; so especially Hengstenberg, in his article on the exposition of the prophets, in the *Evangel. Kirchenzeitung*, 1833, No. 23 sq. (1); nay, the very admissibility of prediction is denied by the *rationalistic* party, on the ground of its destroying human freedom and interfering with history. The latter proposition, indeed, if laid down in its generality, would lead to a view of the world directly unreasonable, and at any rate unscriptural. For what kind of a course of the world would that be, which should be dependent in its chief elements solely upon the accidental decisions of the human will? Old Testament theology, however, has to do only with the question *whether prophecy does or does not attribute to itself as essential the characteristic of predicting particular events* (2); and in this respect it may suffice to bring forward, besides the fundamental passage Deut. xviii. 22, the very decided expressions contained on this subject in the prophetical book, Isa. xl. sqq. Here we find the greatest emphasis laid upon the circumstances that the deliverance of Israel from the Babylonian captivity had been long predicted by prophecy, and that the prophet now speaking foretells the appearance of Cyrus before it takes place. It main-

Digitized by Google

tains also that the prediction of such particular events is a proof that the God of Israel is the true God, while on the other hand it asserts that the vanity of the heathen gods is manifested by their inability to foretell anything; see xli. 21–28, xlii. 9. When it is said in the latter passage, "New things do I declare: *before they spring forth* I tell you of them," the notion of pure prediction could hardly be more precisely expressed; comp. also xliii. 9–13, xliv. 25 sq., xlv. 21. The unbelief of the people is represented, xlviii. 3, as without excuse, for the very reason that the predictions of the prophets were authenticated by their fulfilment. And when it is said, ver. 7, "They are created now, and not from the beginning, even before the day when thou heardest them not; lest thou shouldest say, Behold, I knew them," prophecy is here very decidedly distinguished from a mere calculation of what the present might further develope. But while, in accordance with the sayings of the Old Testament, we claim for prophecy the characteristic of prediction, we *by no means assert the complete identity of the prediction with its fulfilment.* Against so supernaturalistic a view of prophecy, which regards it, so to speak, as only the mirrored reflection, cast backwards from the future, of New Testament personages and occurrences, it is very easy to contend, and to show how very different would have been the purport of the Old Testament prophecies if they had been of the nature in question. The inalienable connection of the words of revelation with its facts, and at the same time the genuine historical nature of revelation, would be annulled, nay, the dignity asserted for the New Testament itself denied, if an adequate impression of New Testament redemption had been already placed before us in Old Testament prophecy. A closer investigation of the peculiarities of the latter enables us to recognise also the limits prescribed to it, and the incompleteness with which it is affected. In discussing this point, we shall proceed from what was stated in the first subdivision concerning the prophetic consciousness.

(1) According to Hengstenberg, no prophecy refers solely to

Digitized by Google

anything individually definite. "Such exposition may be serviceable to apologetics; but apologetics are only for the few, and not of sufficient importance even to them, for God to have done so much in this respect." If prophecy seems to foretell anything individually definite, this is but the most obvious realization of an idea in an object. Everything in prophecy applies to the one church of God existing in uninterrupted continuity throughout the ages. Within us and without us, we again find Israel, Edom, and Babylon. Nothing any longer appears to us merely past, nothing merely future; but all equally past, present, and future, as cannot but be the case with the word of the eternal God. The temporal and local definiteness of individual fulfilments is just that which is incidental. If, nevertheless, we are obliged to own that some predictions are special and historically characteristic, these appear just as concessions to the weak faith of the church. That the influence of Schleiermacher's doctrine is, as has been remarked, perceptible in the turn here taken by Hengstenberg's theory of prophecy, is so far possible, that Schleiermacher also (*Der christliche Glaube*, § 103. 3) regards as the essential element of prophecy, not a prediction relating to particulars, to which now a less now a higher degree of correctness is awarded, but the manifestation of general principles. There is, however, this difference between the two, that Schleiermacher sees in the ideas of Divine election and retribution by which prophecy is pervaded, only "Jewish notions," and finds the Messianic element of prophecy in the fact that it expresses the future of the Sent of God in a manner which, rightly understood, involves the "termination of these two Jewish ideas;" while Hengstenberg, on the contrary, acknowledges, as has been said, in the prophetic ideas—after, indeed, depriving them of their particular definiteness—the eternal laws of God's government of the world and the church. And who can deny to Hengstenberg the special merit of having, by thus giving prominence to the enduring value of prophecy, again set up that prophetic word which had long lain under a bushel as a light to enable us to understand the ways of God, and of having again rendered accessible to many, the treasures of instruction and consolation contained therein for all ages of the church militant.

(2) Comp. Bleek, *Einleitung in das A. T.* sec. 1, p. 434 sqq.

Digitized by Google

§ 215.

The Peculiarities of Old Testament Prophecy.

1. The matter of revelation being given to the prophets in the form of intuition (§ 210), the *future appeared to them as immediately present*, complete, or at all events in progress. Hence the frequent use of the so-called *Præteritum propheticum*, by the misunderstanding of which, prediction has so often been taken for description; comp. *e.g.* Isa. ix. 1, 5 (1). How great soever the distance, according to human computation, of the things predicted, they are actually in train to the prophetic glance, and all that intervenes can only help to hasten their fulfilment. See as a chief passage, Hab. ii. 3: "The vision is yet for an appointed time, but it hastens to its end, and lies not; though it tarry, wait for it, for it will surely come, it will not tarry." What the prophet sees are, as they are called Rev. i. 1, simply things ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει; for in the invisible world which is disclosed to the prophet, all is active, in motion, about to approach. Connected with this peculiarity of prophecy is the circumstance that *it gives for the most part only a subordinate importance to dates*—for the most part, we say, for there are certainly cases also where great emphasis is laid upon them, as *e.g.* Ezek. xii., where the prophet announces to those who inconsiderately derided the predicted judgments because their fulfilment was delayed, that this fulfilment should shortly take place; while on the other hand we find some, *e.g.* Dan. x. 14, where the vision points to a more remote time. Sometimes the dates given have evidently a *symbolical* meaning, and must not for this reason be pressed to the very letter. Such are the seventy years of Tyre, "according to the days of one king," Isa. xxiii. 15, 17; the seventy years, Jer. xxv.; the seventy weeks of Daniel, ch. ix. Such dates, too, as those of Isa. xvi. 14, xxi. 16, may be included.

Digitized by Google

In general, however, the word of the Lord, Acts i. 7: *οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστι γνῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιρούς, οὓς ὁ πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ*, applies also to the prophets, who limit themselves to indefinite dates, such as: in that day (בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא); after this (אַחֲרֵי כֵן), etc. *The grouping of that which is predicted according to the necessary sequences of its essential elements* takes the place of chronological statements. And this is effected in the following manner: While heathenism can attain to no knowledge of the design of its history, it is essential to Old Testament prophecy to be always directed to *the consummation of the kingdom of God*, by announcing *the ways in which God conducts His purposes of salvation, from the actual present to their appointed end.* In other words, what happens בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים forms the boundary of the prophetic horizon. This expression does not signify, as it has often been explained, "in the time to come," "in the future," but (אַחֲרִית signifying, in contrast to רֵאשִׁית, that to which anything runs) "at the end of the days," *i.e.* at the close of this dispensation, as already correctly rendered by the LXX. by *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*, or *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου* (*ἐσχάτων*) *τῶν ἡμερῶν*. It is true that the meaning is a relative one. In Gen. xlix. 1, where the expression first occurs, it refers to the time of the settlement of the tribes in the promised land; for the final fulfilment of the Divine promise is thus made the standpoint of Jacob's blessing. In Deut. iv. 3 it denotes the time which forms the turning-point for the restoration of Israel; while in xxxi. 29, on the contrary, the rejection of Israel is itself reckoned to pertain to the אַחֲרִית. But in prophetic diction, properly so called, אַחֲרִית is, as has been said, the time of the consummation of redemption (Hos. iii. 5, Isa. ii. 3, with Mic. iv. 1, Jer. xlviii. 47, Ezek. xxxviii. 16). The event next preceding this אַחֲרִית is judgment, and indeed judgment both upon the rebellious people of God and the sinful world. This judgment is directly connected with the days in which the prophet lives, for these, because of the sins of Israel and the Gentile nations, already bear in their bosom the judgments of God.

Digitized by Google

Thus the matter of prophecy may be defined by its three elements,—*guilt, judgment* (first upon the house of God, then upon the world), *redemption*. The progress of the kingdom of God forms itself, in prophetic vision, into a picture in which judgment generally forms the foreground and redemption the background. In the Book of Isaiah, xl. sqq., on the other hand, redemption occupies the foreground, but still in such wise that its blessings are depicted as not unaccompanied by judgment. The contemplation of impending judgments, then, usually extends to that of the last judgment, as *e.g.* in the Book of Joel, where the description of the devastation by locusts, with which Judah is chastised, is enlarged into a description of the coming of the last day (the day of the Lord), the final judgment, which, however, on Judah's repentance, is, though invoked upon her, inflicted upon the secular powers; and as in New Testament prophecy also (Matt. xxiv.), the judgment upon the world is placed in direct connection with that upon Jerusalem. So, too, the contemplation of approaching deliverance is usually extended to take in the consummation of redemption, as *e.g.* Isa. vii.–xii. proceeds from an announcement of deliverance from Assyria, to a prophecy of Messianic blessings. Thus prophecy beholds in every event the coming of the Judge and Saviour of the world to set up His kingdom. In this combination of the nearer and more distant future—in this placing of the present government of God's kingdom in the light of the end—lies what has been called the *perspective* character of prophecy, as Bengel in particular, in his Gnomon on Matt. xxiv. 29, has so aptly designated it (2). This characteristic of prophecy is manifested with especial beauty in the Book of Isaiah, xl.–lxvi. The Divine act of delivering the people from the Babylonian captivity, and their restoration to the promised land, form, with the Messianic redemption and the admission of all nations into the kingdom of God, one great connected picture, closing with the creation of the new heavens and the new earth (3). To the prophets themselves, moreover, the

Digitized by Google

time when their predictions should be fulfilled was, as we are told 1 Pet. i. 11, a subject of investigation.

2. The fact that the matter of prophecy is given in the form of such an intuition, also furnishes the reason why it always sees the realization of that matter in *particular events which are complete in themselves.* Thus in Joel, ch. iii., the impartation of the Holy Spirit to the people of God is conceived as the single fact of His outpouring amidst magnificent natural phenomena, and so also is the judgment of the world mostly represented as a single act of judgment against the secular power at the moment present to the spirit of the prophet. In the fulfilment, on the contrary, that which is but momentary in the prophetic intuition is drawn out into a process of long and gradual development (4); and when a prediction attains its first stage of fulfilment, there opens out from the standpoint of subsequent prophets, in virtue of that *law of dilation*, as Ebrard in his *Commentary on Hebrews* calls it, a new perspective towards the consummation of judgment and redemption. Hence it happens that many expositors speak of a two, a three, or even a fourfold fulfilment.

(1) Isa. ix. 1: "The people that walked in darkness, רָאוּ אוֹר גָּדוֹל." Ver. 5 says of the birth of the Messiah: יֶלֶד יֻלַּד־לָנוּ; and this has been said to mean Hezekiah, then twelve years of age, the destined deliverer of the people.

(2) Bengel says, *id.*: *Prophetia est ut pictura regionis cujuspiam, quæ in proximo tecta et calles et pontes notat distincte, procul valles et montes latissime patentes in augustum cogit.* Velthusen contributes much profitable matter on this point in the article *De optica rerum futurarum descriptione*, in the *Commentationes theologicæ* of Velthusen, Kuinoel, and Ruperti, vi. 1799, p. 75 sqq.

(3) The view of a perspective character in prophecy is not refuted by what Steudel has advanced against it, in the article on the interpretation of the prophets in the *Tübinger Zeitschr.* 1834, No. 1, p. 121 sqq.

Digitized by Google

(4) Compare what is said (§ 221) on the description of the judgment of the world in Amos, compared with that in Joel.

§ 216.

Continuation.

3. The matter of prophecy displaying itself to the intuition as a multitude of individual facts, it may sometimes appear as though single predictions contradicted each other, when they are in fact only *those parts mutually completing each other into which the ideas revealed have been separated.* Thus, *e.g.*, the representation of Messiah is at one time that of the gentle Prince of Peace, at another that of a powerful and warlike hero who overthrows His enemies; on the one side a successful ruler, on the other the servant of God who atones for the sins of the people by undergoing death. Among the prophets themselves, even when they unite such discrepant features, the union, as the nature of an intuition involves, is merely one of external juxtaposition. The two characteristics, *e.g.*, of the Messianic age, that therein the kingdom of God should triumph over all enemies, and that nevertheless it should be a period of universal peace, are thus united, Mic. v. 3–10: Messiah is great, even to the ends of the earth; He feeds His people, He is the peace. When, however, the Assyrian (the hostile secular power, according to the prophet's horizon) should invade the land, the war should be transferred to his own country by a number of generals, the enemies of Israel exterminated, etc. The internal harmony of the two views—that Christ is our peace and at the same time one who is come to send a sword, that the kingdom of God is at once a contending and a peaceful kingdom—is first found in the New Testament. The fact that Old Testament prophecy continues to behold the particular as particular, is most clearly shown by the two lines running beside each other by which it advances, and according to which,

Digitized by Google

while the promised redemption is made on the one hand to depend upon the coming of Jehovah Himself to His holy temple to set up His kingdom on Zion, it is connected on the other with the birth of the great Branch of David, to whom God will give in its full glory the kingdom of His ancestors (1). Both views are fulfilled in the σκήνωσις of the eternal λόγος in the Son of David, in which respect St. Paul's statement, 2 Cor. i. 20 (2), that all the promises of God are yea and amen, are harmoniously fulfilled, in Him, holds good, while the knowledge of individual prophets still continues but fragmentary (1 Cor. xiii. 9).

4. The matter of prophecy being given to the prophets in the form of intuition, it is brought down, as far as its form is concerned, to the level of the beholding subject himself; hence prophecy is affected by the limits of the sphere of Old Testament life, of the special circumstances and individual peculiarity of the prophet. The future kingdom of God is beheld by the prophets as being in all essential matters an extended and glorified form of the Old Testament theocracy. The admission of the nations into this kingdom is their travelling to Mount Zion (Isa. ii.), their attainment of rights of citizenship in Jerusalem, Ps. lxxxvii., etc. (3); the hostile world is personified, in the prophetic intuition, in Assyria, Egypt, Babylon, Moab, Edom, etc., who were then the enemies of Israel. It is this which has been called the Old Testament covering of prophecy, but which is incorrectly regarded, especially by Hengstenberg, as a merely symbolical covering in the consciousness of the prophets themselves. A consciously symbolical diction is indeed frequently used by the prophets, as by other authors. In many cases there may also be in the prophets a conscious fluctuation between symbolical and literal language; nay, it is often evident how superior is the fulness of the idea, how far the Divine matter surpasses its limited form. One may often feel, when reading the prophetic word, how much further the spiritual meaning reaches than the letter expresses;

Digitized by Google

how prophecy struggles, as it were, to give its thoughts a fitting incorporation. Compare such descriptions as Zech. ii. and similar passages (4). Generally speaking, however, the prophets, when beholding the future state of God's kingdom in an Old Testament form, mean just what they say. As they understand it, the Holy Land and Jerusalem are to be the centres of the glorified kingdom of God, and restored Israel is to be at the head of the nations, etc.; when they prophesy against Assyria, Babylon, and Edom, they mean these very powers, and the κόσμος hostile to the kingdom of God is represented to them by those then existent kingdoms. It is not the consciousness of the individual prophet, but the spirit of revelation, which already within the Old Testament strips off, as may often be pointed out, at every higher stage of prophecy, the temporary form cleaving to earlier stages, until the fulfilment fully shows how far the symbolical covering extended. The identity of prophecy and fulfilment is not a direct but an indirect one, brought about by means of an historical process, which conducts to a higher realization that which, at a preparatory stage, had been beheld in a still inadequate form. On the other hand, however, even the symbolical covering of prophecy must not be treated as something non-essential. For the ideas of revelation do not appear, even in their Old Testament fulfilment, as abstract propositions, but as Divine acts, as a history of the kingdom of God. In virtue of the organic connection existing between the two Testaments, revelation brings forth in the New Testament circumstances, conditions, and facts which are *analogous*, even with respect to their external form, to their pre-representation in the Old. And this is to say that the Old Testament form, with which the matter of prophecy is covered, is *typical* of the form of the New Testament fulfilment, and that the coincidence of the two may extend to individual features (5).

5. Finally, in forming a correct judgment of the relation between prophecy and fulfilment, the point yet remains to be

Digitized by Google

considered, that God having in His revelation placed Himself in an *historical* relation with mankind, and the kingdom of God therefore advancing, not by a process of nature, but by moral order, the fulfilment of prophecy is not placed outside the sphere of *human freedom*, though so indeed provided for that the Divine counsel cannot in the end fail to be victoriously brought to pass in spite of all opposition. As the fulfilment of the promises and threats connected with the law (Ex. xxiii. 20–33, Lev. xxvi., Deut. viii. sq.) depends upon the attitude of the people with respect to the law, while still the final realization of the theocratic destination of Israel is beyond all question (Lev. xxvi. 44 sq., Deut. xxx. 1–6, compare § 90, vol. i.), so is it also with the matter of prophecy. This, like the law, subserves, in the first place, an *educational* purpose, by making disclosures concerning the future to man for his good. God having, as it is said Ezek. xxxiii. 11, no pleasure in the death of a sinner, but in his turning from his ways, the first purpose of the prophetic announcement of judgment is to lead the people to repentance; and hence, if this repentance takes place, the threatened judgments may be averted (6). The Old Testament declares as unambiguously as possible, that not every predicted judgment must of necessity be inflicted in the manner spoken; that the Divine threatening leaves man for a long time space for repentance; that there is even, as it is expressed, a Divine "repenting," and that not merely with respect to Israel, but to heathen nations also. Comp. such passages as Joel ii. 12 sqq. (according to which the judgment already approaching might be averted by repentance, and indeed was subsequently averted), Jer. iv. 3 sq., xxvi. 3, xxxvi. 3, Ezek. xviii. 30–32. The chief passage, however, is Jer. xviii. 1–10, whose purport is as follows: As the potter can immediately mar again the clay which he had formed into a vessel, if the vessel displeases him, so can Jehovah alter the form and fate of a nation as He pleases. In such non-fulfilment, however, of His threats and promises, He acts not arbi-

Digitized by Google

trarily, but according to a law of righteous retribution (7). This doctrine forms, as is obvious, one of the fundamental thoughts of the Book of Jonah (iii. 3–10); comp. also narratives like 2 Sam. xii. 13; 1 Kings xxi. 28 sq.; and especially Jer. xxvi. 18 sq. It is also shown, Amos vii. 1–6, how the intercession for the sinful people, of the just who stand in the gap, may avail to avert a threatened judgment. There is, however, a limit to the respites granted by God's long-suffering. The impenitence of the people may reach a height at which no intercession on the part of the righteous remnant is any longer possible, ver. 8, Jer. xv. 1, and when the prophetic announcement of judgment is no longer intended to evoke repentance, but to mature obduracy; comp. as chief passage, Isa. vi. 9 sqq. In such cases, those predictions also whose fulfilment has been hitherto delayed, reappear in full force. We see this from the quotation of the prediction of Micah (the younger) in Jer. xxvi. 18. To the people of his days this prophet had uttered the prediction: "Zion shall be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of a forest." When, then, as it is further said, ver. 19, Hezekiah feared the Lord, and besought the Lord, "the Lord repented of the evil which He had pronounced against them." As soon, however, as the penitent return of the people was followed by a fresh apostasy, the threats of judgment again became valid, and the subsequent generation experienced their complete fulfilment. So, too, when *blessings* are predicted, the fulfilment of such prediction depends upon moral causes, viz. upon the obedient submission of the people to the Divine will, while, nevertheless, this fulfilment cannot be rendered doubtful by any obstacles which man can oppose to it (8). Nor does the latter result from Zech. vi. 15 (9). This passage cannot be understood as making the appearance of Messiah, and especially the participation of the Gentiles in His kingdom, depend on the fidelity of the covenant people, though it does connect the mode in which the promise should be ful-

Digitized by Google

filled, the how, and the how far, Israel should become the stock and branch of the future Church, on the obedience of the people to the Divine word (10).

(1) We shall subsequently see (§ 229) how even the Old Testament struggles to harmonize both views.

(2) 2 Cor. i. 20: *ὅσαι γὰρ ἐπαγγελίαι Θεοῦ, ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ναὶ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἀμήν, τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς τὴν δόξαν δι' ἡμῶν.*

(3) Comp. how, according to § 201, sacrificial service is continued in the worship of the future.

(4) When Zech. ii. describes the future times of redemption, in which, ver. 11, the heathen nations join themselves to the Lord, it is evident that such a kingdom of God can no longer be concentrated within the narrow walls of the ancient Jerusalem. How then is the matter presented to prophetic intuition? פְּרָזוֹת תֵּשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלִַם, Jerusalem is to lay open like a village, as a free and public district; Jehovah is Himself the fiery wall around her, and the glory in her midst. (But this is not saying, as Kliefoth explains the matter, that the Jerusalem of the latter days is to extend over the whole earth, to be a multitude of residences scattered over the whole world.)

(5) So *e.g.* in the prophetic delineation (Isa. liii.) of the Servant of the Lord atoning by His death for the sins of the people, and afterwards glorified. To this must be added, that neither do we as yet behold the physical nature of the Divine kingdom, but are still waiting, on the assurance of New Testament prophecy, which has taken up and carried on that of the old covenant, for the time when, as it is said Rev. xxi. 3, a tabernacle of God will be among men. For this reason it would ill become an expositor to attempt to determine beforehand how far the last form of the kingdom of God is to coincide with the prophetic descriptions of the last things. When Hengstenberg (*Christologie*, i. sec. 3, p. 63, ii. sec. 1, p. 257 sq.) declares himself opposed to those who dream of some future restoration of Israel to the Holy Land, and says, "Even supposing the children of Israel were to return to Canaan, this would have nothing to do with the prophecy in question" (Hos. ii. 2), he asserts more than any one has a right to do (comp. also the above article, p. 650).

Digitized by Google

(6) Jerome on Ezek. xxxiii. (ed. Vallars, v. p. 396) rightly defines this purpose when he says: "*Nec statim sequitur, ut, quia propheta prædicit, veniat, quod prædixit. Non enim prædixit, ut veniat, sed ne veniat: nec quia Deus loquitur, necesse est fieri quod minatur, sed ideo comminatur, ut convertatur ad pœnitentiam cui minatur, et non fiat quod futurum est, si verba Domini contemnantur.*"

(7) Jer. xviii. 7 sq.: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy; if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them."

(8) Comp. on this subject Caspari, on Micah, p. 160 sqq., and his *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Buch Jesaja*, p. 96 sqq. The relation of prophecy to fulfilment has been elucidated from this point of view, especially by Bertheau in his article, *Die alttest. Weissagung von Israels Reichsherrlichkeit in seinem Lande* (*Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1859 *and* 1860), in which, however, he goes so far, as Tholuck (*id.* p. 139) justly objects, as to run the risk of making the notion not only of prediction but even of prophecy wholly illusory. See what is further stated in opposition to Bertheau in the above article, p. 658.

(9) Zech. vi. 15: "They that are far off shall come and build in the temple of the Lord. . . . And it shall come to pass, if ye will diligently obey the voice of the Lord your God." Comp. Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, ii. sec. 3, 1, p. 320 sq.

(10) Israel may, through unfaithfulness, be again in such a condition as that which it incurred by its apostasy before the Babylonian captivity. But is the *consummation* of redemption possible while Israel is, as a nation, in a state of rejection? The Old Testament returns an absolute negative to this question. It speaks only of a temporary rejection, which, moreover, takes place in such wise that Israel does not perish as a nation, but is preserved for future restoration. Was, then, this law abolished when Israel rejected the gracious visitation of their Messiah, and the kingdom of God was taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof? (Matt. xxi.

Digitized by Google

43.) Are the predictions of the prophets which speak of the glories of Israel in the latter days abrogated? or are they only spiritually fulfilled to the Christian church, of which the stock indeed was formed by the elect of Israel? These questions are answered by Bertheau (in accordance with older Protestant theology; see p. 646 of the article cited) as decidedly in the affirmative, as, we feel convinced, especially on the ground of Rom. xi. 25 sqq., they should be in the negative. See further particulars in the article quoted, p. 659. Comp. also Luthardt, *die Lehre von den letzten Dingen*, pp. 18 and 106 sqq.

FOURTH DIVISION.

OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

§ 217.

Survey.

The chief elements in the process of development exhibited by the kingdom of God are, according to prophetic intuition, the following. Prophecy starts from the state of contradiction to its Divine election into which Israel fell by apostasy. Sinful Israel belied its blessed vocation. Instead of testifying for the true God before the heathen, its very nature testifies against Him. God's holiness obliges Him to do away with this contradiction. The means by which He effects this end is the infliction of judgment. He ejects His revolted people from their home, and delivers them up to the heathen powers. Thus, however, a fresh contradiction arises: Israel was chosen to realize the Divine purposes of redemption even among the heathen; but now that judgment has fallen upon Israel, the heathen powers triumph over the people of Jehovah, and therefore, as they suppose, over Jehovah Himself. This contradiction also must be done away with; and this is effected by

Digitized by Google

the judgments inflicted upon the heathen powers for their self-exaltation against the Lord, even after they had fulfilled the Divine counsels; and by the destruction of every secular power; and the restoration, through this universal judgment, of the covenant people, who, though rejected, were preserved in rejection for the fulfilment of their destination. The remnant of the people is, however, restored under the great Son of David in such wise that it is now capable, as a church inwardly sanctified, of realizing the Divine counsel. It now fulfils its mission,—light going forth from it to the Gentile world, and the remnants of the nations preserved from judgment being incorporated therein, and assisting in their turn in bringing back the still dispersed members of the covenant people, until throughout the whole world every knee shall bow before the living God, and every tongue confess Him. Jehovah has now taken possession of His sovereignty over the earth; His kingdom is come; the events of history are concluded (1).

(1) The attribute, in virtue of which God thus determines the progress of His kingdom on earth by judgment and deliverance, is His צְדָקָה, His righteousness.

FIRST SUBDIVISION.

THE PURPOSE OF GOD'S KINGDOM; THE CONTRADICTION THERETO PRESENTED BY THE PRESENT; THE ABOLITION OF THIS CONTRADICTION BY JUDGMENT.

I. THE DESIGN OF GOD'S KINGDOM.

§ 218.

The idea of God's purpose in setting up a kingdom includes the following elements: 1. Jehovah as the Creator and Lord of the world is in Himself the God of all nations; but, 2. He is not yet God to all nations, and is only manifest as God to Israel, His chosen people; 3. By means of Israel, however, He

Digitized by Google

is to be universally known and acknowledged; as He is now the King of His own people, so is His kingdom to be set up among all the nations of the world by their means. Of these elements, the first two are, as we have seen (§ 81), already decidedly found in the Pentateuch; it may suffice to suggest Ex. xix. 5 sq. (1). Nor is the third element absent from the Pentateuch (2); but it is only brought prominently forward in the patriarchal promise, by which the severance of a race to become the recipients of revelation was accompanied: in the seed of Abraham shall all the families of the earth bless themselves, Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18, xxvi. 4, xxviii. 14, comp. § 23, with note 5. This element, on the other hand, falls into the background at the period of the foundation of the theocracy. Even though it is said to Pharaoh, Ex. ix. 16, "For this purpose have I raised thee up, . . . that my name may be declared throughout the whole earth;" and though the Lord swears, Num. xiv. 21, "As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord;" that which is first of all implied is the glorification of the power and greatness of the living God before all the heathen, as it had already been glorified before the gods of Egypt, the future admission of the heathen into the kingdom of God being not as yet announced by these words. The latter thought is first brought into full light by *prophecy*. In the older prophets, indeed, the political horizon is still very limited, including at first only the neighbouring nations; still their descriptions of God's guidance of the history of these people, see *e.g.* Amos i. sq. (comp. also vi. 14, § 176), ix. 7 (§ 219, note 4), presuppose that universalism which is distinctly expressed in the judgment depicted Joel iv. When, however, Israel fully entered into conflict with the secular powers, and thus appeared on a wider historical stage, prophecy clearly and completely recognised that government of the God of Israel which embraces all nations, determines their histories, and directs all their ways towards the accomplishment of His own purposes. It is the Lord who, according to Isa.

Digitized by Google

x. 5 sqq., uses the Assyrian power as the rod of His anger, and directs every step of the conqueror, xxxvii. 28. From Him proceed, according to ch. xix., the revolutions and civil wars of Egypt, which are to prepare for its conversion; for, according to ver. 23, the Egyptians are one day to serve Him with the Assyrians. It is He who, according to Hab. i. 6 sq., arouses the Chaldeans and causes them to perform terrible acts; who, according to Jer. xxvii. 5 sqq., made the earth and all that is upon it, and gives it to whom He will; who now gives all lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, His servant. Ezekiel declares, xxxi. 9, that it is He who raised the king of Egypt to the height of prosperity, and again (xxx. 4 sq.) put the sword into the hand of the king of Babylon to overthrow the power of Egypt, and to show the Egyptians that He is the true God. It is He who is said, Isa. xiii. 3 sq., Jer. li. 11 sqq., to lead the Median hosts against Babylon, and, Isa. xli. sqq., to use Cyrus, though he knows it not, as His instrument. The purpose, however, of all this intervention of God in the heathen world is expressed, xlv. 22 sq., in the words: "Turn unto me, . . . all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." The Book of Daniel, in particular, portrays in magnificent touches the universality of the Divine kingdom: "God changeth times and seasons: He removeth kings and setteth up kings," ii. 21. The kingdoms of the world which are from beneath have run their courses according to His appointment, ch. ii. and vii., that the kingdom of God which is to come from above, and which all people and tongues must serve, vii. 14, may be set up in its eternal power and glory.

(1) Ex. xix. 5 sq.: "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation."

(2) Comp. the prophetic saying of Noah, § 21, with note 3.

Digitized by Google

II. THE RELATION OF THE PRESENT TO THE PURPOSE OF THE DIVINE KINGDOM.

§ 219.

What, then, it may be asked, is the relation of the present to the purpose of God's kingdom? Israel and the nations of the world are in a state of contradiction thereto. With respect to Israel, we have already described, in Div. II. § 202, and comparatively in the historical sections, and need not here repeat, how the conviction dawned upon the prophets that the Israel of the present was incapable of fulfilling its mission to the world. This nation, which was to be the means of converting the heathen to God, had become worse than the heathen; comp. also the not yet quoted passage, Ex. v. 5 sqq. (1). In what relation, then, do the heathen stand to the kingdom of God? is a question which we must now enter into somewhat more particularly. The doctrine that the heathen, as such, form with respect to the privileged people of God a class entirely without rights, nay, exposed to the wrath of God, has already been imputed to the Old Testament. According to this view, the roots of the well-known arrogant particularism of the Pharisees are to be found in the Old Testament. But if it is said, Jer. x. 25 (comp. with the parallel passage, Ps. lxxix. 6 sq.), "Pour out Thy fury upon the heathen that have not known Thee, and upon the families that call not upon Thy name," it is added, "For they have eaten up Jacob, and devoured him, and consumed him," etc., showing that not the heathen in general are intended, but the nations who have raged against Israel. If Mal. i. 2, "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," is also appealed to, and the question asked, Is it not here taught that God, for no reason but of His own choice, loves one people and makes another a vessel of wrath?—we reply that, though this expression cannot

Digitized by Google

be got over, as Steudel endeavours, by taking it in a merely relative signification, as though to *hate* meant only to love less, still we have here no causeless *reprobatio* in the sense of a Calvinistic absolute decree, for in ver. 4 it is immediately added, "Edom is a region of wickedness" (גְּבוּל רִשְׁעָה); and this is explained by the prophetical passages, Joel iv. 19, Amos i. 9, etc., concerning Edom's rage against the covenant people. More difficult is, at a first glance, the much-discussed passage, Isa. xliii. 3 sq.: "I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Cush and Seba for thee, because thou wast precious in my sight," etc.; "therefore I gave men for thee, and nations for thy life." Does, then, this passage indeed teach that God substitutes guiltless nations for His chosen people, who properly deserve punishment? By no means. The passage only applies to the history of nations the principle laid down, Prov. xi. 8 and xxi. 18, with respect to individuals (2), viz. that God's judgments upon the wicked subserve the best interests of the godly. For a hint that these heathen nations were innocent victims for the sake of Israel, is no more given in this place than in the case of Pharaoh, when he is set forth, Ex. ix. 16, as an example of judgment. The heathen nations are not, indeed, entitled to any favour from God, inasmuch as they, like all creatures, can make no claims upon Him in whose presence they are, as it is said, Isa. xl. 15–17, "as a drop of a bucket, as the small dust of the balance, as nothing." But this is true of Israel also, according to their condition by nature; comp. Deut. vii. 7 (§ 81), Isa. xiv. 9 sqq. (3). Israel itself has only a claim of *grace*, and that a conditional one. Incessantly do the prophets testify against the delusion that the fact of their election could give the rebellious nation claims upon God. On the contrary, the significant passage, Amos ix. 7, declares the covenant-breaking people to be on a level with the heathen (4). On the other hand, God's long-suffering watches also over the heathen; comp. the passage Jer. xvii. 7 sq. (already quoted, § 216, and note 7, in another connection), and the Book of Jonah, which

Digitized by Google

teaches how the patience of God gives to the heathen also space for repentance. The heathen are certainly already guilty before God on account of their idolatry, the folly and worthlessness of which they might readily have perceived (Isa. xl. 17 sqq., xli. 23 sq., xliv. 9, xlvi. 5 sq., Jer. x. 8 sqq., Ps. cxv. 4 sqq.). For this, however, they are punished by that state of helplessness into which all heathenism falls, and which manifests that it is forsaken of God, as is so admirably portrayed in the prophecy concerning Moab, Isa. xv. sq. (comp. especially xvi. 12), in Isa. xli. 6 sq., and other passages. Undoubtedly certain expositors have explained passages like Ps. ix. 18: יָשׁוּבוּ רְשָׁעִים לִשְׁאוֹלָה כָּל־גּוֹיִם שְׁכֵחֵי אֱלֹהִים ("the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the heathen that forget God"), as declaring that the heathen are guilty, רְשָׁעִים, because they have forgotten and renounced that knowledge of God which was imparted to them by primitive revelation. But the context is decidedly against a theoretical view of the passage, and shows that a practical forgetfulness of God is intended when שְׁכֵחֵי אֱלֹהִים are spoken of, and therefore that the heathen have renounced that law of God which was known to them also. Hence the passage is well elucidated by Isa. xxiv., where the prophet sees a general judgment overwhelming the whole earth, because, according to ver. 5, "they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant," wherefore "the earth is defiled under the inhabitants thereof," —the words evidently pointing back to the Noachian covenant with the world, and the law connected therewith. That, however, which properly exposes the heathen to the judgments proceeding from the God of Israel, is their *enmity towards the covenant people*, and this for the following reasons:—1. It is characteristic of Israel, as the covenant people, that no nation in the world was ever so bitterly hated by other nations as it was, because it claimed to be the Lord's people, not in the same manner as other nations might boast of their own gods without denying the existence of other gods, but because it

Digitized by Google

declared the gods of other nations to be things of nought (§ 42. 2), and demanded of them submission to the God of Israel. For this reason, too, hatred of Israel was hatred of Israel's God. Malicious delight in the misfortunes of Israel was a joy that the God who was declared to be alone powerful was just as powerless as the people that were called by His name; comp. the defiant address of the generals of Sennacherib, xxxvi. 18–20. With this is connected, 2. the fact that the heathen nations whom God made use of as instruments for the chastisement of His people did not regard themselves as such, but behaved towards them with self-exaltation, and treated them with immoderate cruelty. Comp. such passages as Isa. x. 5 sqq. (5), Zech. i. 15, Isa. xlvii. 6. All human ὕβρις, however, as such, exposes to the judgment of God. The arrogant and self-relying creature must be reduced to its own nothingness by the holy God, Isa. ii. 11 sqq. (6). In the Old Testament it is chiefly Babylon which, by reason of its origin (Gen. xi.), is affected by the stamp of that Titanic pride, that self-deification, described Hab. i. 11, 16, Isa. xiv. 13 (7), which makes Babylon a typical instance of Divine judgment.

(1) Ezek. v. 5 sqq.: "This is Jerusalem which I have set in the midst of the nations and countries round about her. But she hath changed my judgments into wickedness more than the nations, and my statutes more than the countries round about her; for they have refused my judgments and my statutes, they have not walked in them."

(2) Prov. xi. 8: "The righteous is delivered out of trouble, and the wicked cometh in his stead." *Ib.* xxi. 18: "The wicked is a ransom for the righteous."

(3) Isa. xlv. 9: "Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker, a potsherd among the potsherds of earth. Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou?"

(4) Amos ix. 7, the prophet exclaims to the sinful people: "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me? . . . have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor (Crete), and the Syrians from Kir?"

Digitized by Google

The thought of this frequently misunderstood passage is identical with that of Rom. ii. 25: *περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ, ἐὰν νόμον πράσσῃς· ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ᾖς, ἡ περιτομή σου ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν.*

(5) Isa. x. 5 sqq.: Assyria is the rod in the hand of Jehovah. According to ver. 7, however, "he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so;" and in ver. 13 he says: "By the strength of my hand have I done it, and by my wisdom; for I am prudent."

(6) Isa. ii. 12: The Lord of hosts holds a day עַל כָּל־גֵּאֶה וְרָם וְעַל כָּל־נִשָּׂא וְשָׁפֵל. Comp. also the former discussion of the notion of the Divine holiness (§ 44).

(7) Hab. i.: It is the Lord who, according to ver. 6, raises up the Chaldeans, "the bitter and hasty nation," which rushes through the land and overcomes all opposition. In ver. 11, however, we are told of the Chaldean, that his strength is his god; ver. 16, that "they sacrifice to their own net, and burn incense to their own drag," wherewith they fish for men. In Isa. xiv. 13, the Chaldean conqueror says in his heart, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God, I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation in the sides of the north," etc.

III. THE JUDGMENT.

§ 220.

The Day of the Lord. The Judgment upon the Covenant People.

"God that is holy sanctifies Himself in righteousness" (הָאֵל הַקָּדוֹשׁ נִקְדַּשׁ בִּצְדָקָה), Isa. v. 16 (1), by sending destructive judgments upon all that opposes His counsels of redemption, and thus ensuring the triumph of His kingdom. The usual designation of this final theocratic judgment is, from Joel i. 15 and ii. 1 onwards, יוֹם יְהוָה, "the day of Jehovah," comp. Zeph. i. 7; "the day of Jehovah's anger," ii. 3; "the great and terrible day of Jehovah," Mal. iv. 5 (2). It is the day on which the Lord will humble all the loftiness of man, and will alone be exalted, Isa. ii. 17, comp. v. 16. The features by

Digitized by Google

which the prophets portray this day, the manner in which they describe it as announced and accompanied by terrible natural phenomena, Joel iii. 3 sq., Isa. xiii. 9 sq., Zeph. i. 15 sqq., — features which have been partially transferred to the eschatological passages of the New Testament,—are not to be regarded as merely poetic colouring, but rest upon the scriptural view of the inalienable connection between the course of nature and the progress of the Divine kingdom. The first question then is: *What is the connection between the judgments on the covenant people and the judgments on the heathen world?* They seem to stand in direct connection in the great picture of judgment in Zeph. i. sq. We have here the same day of the Lord going forth upon Jerusalem and upon the nations of the world, the whole earth being consumed by the fire of the Divine wrath (3). More strictly speaking, however, the relation of the two judgments to each other is, that the judgment of Israel in point of time precedes, that of the nations of the world follows,—the deliverance of the covenant people being effected by means of the latter. Judgment must first begin at the house of God, as St. Peter expresses it (1 Pet. iv. 17). "You only have I known," it is said, Amos iii. 2, "of all the families of the earth: therefore will I punish you for your iniquities." Just because Israel was held up as an example to the world of how God loves, so is it now to bear witness how He punishes. "I will execute judgment in the midst of thee, in the sight of the nations," Ezek. v. 8. Every pledge of God's election now becomes a pledge of judgment to the apostate people. They who trust in their power of saying, "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord is here," are reminded by Jeremiah, vii. 4–15, how judgment had already fallen upon the place of the sanctuary at Shiloh. And Ezekiel, in the majestic vision recorded ch. ix., sees judgment beginning at the sanctuary and those who are called to be its guardians. We have lastly to notice the *historical progress* observable in the announcement of judgment upon the covenant people. In the Book of

Digitized by Google

Joel, Judah is to incur only a visitation whiclr leads the people to repentance (4). In Amos, the judgments to be inflicted upon the ten tribes occupy the foreground,—"that sinful kingdom" (which does not at the same time apply to Judah) being destined to irrevocable destruction, ix. 8, because the gradually increasing chastisements inflicted on her have been in vain, iv. 6–11, vii. 1–9, while only a state of extreme depression is predicted, ix. 11, concerning Judah. On the other hand, Hos. ii. 2 seems, though the meaning of the passage has been disputed, to assume the rejection of Judah also. And after the catastrophe of Samaria fails to have the effect of leading Judah to repentance, prophecy announces henceforth the ruin of the kingdom of Judah, the destruction of the temple, the desolation of the land, and the captivity of the people, the locality of which is first designated as Babylon in Mic. iv. 10, Isa. xxxix. 6 sq. Judgment being the abrogation of the covenant relation between God and His people, it was inflicted (as we saw, § 89, Pt. I., on the doctrine of retribution) in the form of expulsion from the Holy Land, to which the theocratic vocation of Israel is united, abolition of worship by the withdrawal of the shechinah from the desecrated sanctuary, and cessation of the theocratic government. Israel was to abide many days without a king, without a prince, and without a sacrifice, Hos. iii. 4, and to eat polluted bread among the heathen, ix. 4, comp. also Lam. ii. 6 sq.

(1) Comp. the remarks, Pt. I. § 44, 47, on the connection between holiness and righteousness.

(2) "A day of trouble and distress, . . . a day of darkness and gloominess," etc., Zeph. i. 15 sq. This day is ever drawing nearer, therefore woe to the workers "who desire the day of the Lord! . . . it is darkness and not light," Amos v. 18.

(3) Comp. the prophecy of Amos, ch. i. sq. (§ 176). The precedence here given to the judgments upon the heathen nations is intended to awaken the reflection: If God thus punishes the heathen for their transgressions against His people, how will He not punish the rebellion of His own people?

Digitized by Google

(4) For the captivity of Judah, Joel iv. 1, and the dispersion of Israel among the heathen, seem to refer only to that partial captivity and dispersion which in the days of this prophet had already commenced.

§ 221.

The Judgment upon the Heathen Nations.

The judgment inflicted upon His covenant people is held up by the Lord as a warning to the heathen. Jehovah, as Judge of His people, is a witness against the heathen, Mic. i. 2. Comp. also as chief passage, Jer. xxv. 29 sqq.: "Do I begin to bring evil on the city which is called by my name, and should ye be utterly unpunished? Ye shall not be unpunished, for I will call for a sword upon all the inhabitants of the earth." Then is described the manner in which evils shall pursue one nation after another like a whirlwind, until the slain shall lie from one end of the earth to the other. The judgment inflicted on the heathen is (as we have already seen, § 219) frequently so connected with those poured out upon Israel, that it is the arrogance with which the heathen, as the Lord's instruments, have treated Israel, the contempt which they have even shown for Israel's God, that call forth the Divine vengeance. The chief passage in this respect is Isa. x. 5 sqq. (§ 219, note 5); comp. also especially Obad. 15 sq. and other passages. The view of the several prophets concerning the judgments upon the heathen world is fashioned according to the historical perspective imposed upon each by contemporary events. The earliest description is found in Joel, ch. iv. All the nations (כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם), by whom, however, as the context shows, the prophet chiefly intends the neighbouring states (Philistines, Phœnicians, Edomites), who have now injured Judah, are summoned to the final judgment in the valley of Jehoshaphat. The nations themselves, indeed, are unacquainted with this Divine counsel,

Digitized by Google

Mic. iv. 12 (1). Their purpose is, according to Joel iii. 9 sqq., by assembling their whole power, to give a final blow to the covenant people, and in this great effort they transform into weapons even the utensils of peace. By the symbolical name, "valley of Jehoshaphat" (valley where Jehovah judges), the prophet undoubtedly intends the valley which subsequently received this name from this very passage, viz. the Kedron valley, which runs between the Mount of Olives and the Temple Mount, and afterwards turns in a south-easterly direction towards the Dead Sea (2). The fact that the nations are assembled in the immediate vicinity of the temple expresses, as Hengstenberg correctly explains it, that the judgment is an outflow of the theocracy; that the nations of the world are punished in the last judgment, not on account of their transgressions against natural law, but for the position they occupy towards the covenant people, and consequently towards the God of revelation (3). While then Amos, whose opening sentence, i. 2, connects his prophecy with Joel iii. 16, divides this general judgment into many acts of national judgment, Isaiah again, xxiv.–xxvii., sets before us a representation of a general judgment of the world, without any definite historical connection, except that a return from Assyrian captivity being spoken of, xxvii. 13, the standpoint of the Assyrian period is adhered to. That a judgment in the heavenly world of spirits is here placed in connection with the judgment of the worldly powers, who are, xxvii. 1, designated by symbolical names, has been already pointed out in the first division (§ 199). On the other hand, prophecy, even in the Assyrian period, points onwards beyond Assyria to Babylon, the power which, after being used as an instrument of judgment against Judah, is itself to be the object of an act of general judgment. Thus in Isa. xiii., the day of Babylon's destruction is, according to ver. 9 sqq., the day which is to make the earth desolate, and to destroy the sinners thereof out of it; the day on which, ver. 13, the Lord will shake the heavens and move the earth

Digitized by Google

out of its place. Habakkuk also, ch. ii., beholds the knowledge of the glory of the Lord overwhelming all earthly greatness as the waters cover the sea, ver. 14, after the overthrow of the Chaldean conqueror. In Jeremiah, too, the series of announcements of judgments upon the nations closes with the magnificent prediction of the fall of Babylon, ch. l. sq. Among other nations, it is Edom which is especially brought forward by the prophets as an object of judgment (comp. Jer. xlix. 7 sqq., which takes up the former prophecy of Obadiah, and Isa. xxxiv., lxiii. 1–6, Ezek. xxxv.), as a type of those nations of heathendom whose origin and the course of whose history had placed them nearest to the kingdom of God, but who had only opposed that kingdom with the more deadly hatred. The fall of Babylon is not, however, contemporaneous with the end of this dispensation, and accordingly the history of the world goes on, and with it the judgment of the world still proceeds. In the first place, the remarkable prophecy of Ezekiel, ch. xxxviii. sq., concerning Gog from the land of Magog, who (בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים), xxxviii. 16, comes with mighty hosts (עַם מְאֻסָּף מִגּוֹיִם, ver. 12), to which the nations of both Asia and Africa contribute, against the Holy Land (4), where the entire army perishes by its mutual animosities, reaches far beyond the fall of Babylon. At any rate, Gog can by no means, as Ewald supposes, signify Babylon, to which the prophecies of Ezekiel do not in general relate. The prophetic intuition is here, on the contrary, extended to the utmost limits of heathendom, for the purpose of impressing the thought that, before the end comes, all the rest of the world will also have attempted to resist the kingdom of God. For this reason, too, it is that Ezekiel's prediction is made use of, Rev. xx. 8, in the description of the last conflict against the Holy City. This prediction of judgment is then taken up by the *post-Babylonian* prophets. First, Haggai, ch. ii. 21 sq., shortly before the Persian wars, announces, but without definitely connecting the prediction with any one secular power, that shaking of the heavens and the earth which

Digitized by Google

is to precede the establishment of the kingdom of God, and in which the Lord will overthrow the throne of kingdoms and destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen, in such wise that every one shall fall by the sword of his brother. Here, as in Ezek. xxxviii. 21, we again meet with the idea, embodied in earlier historical occurrences, Judg. vii. 22, 2 Chron. xx. 22 sq., that the powers of the κόσμος are to consume each other, to prepare for the triumphant progress of the kingdom of God. The passages in Zech. xii.–xiv., especially ch. xiv., are still more closely connected with the prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Gog, and at the same time carry on still further that of Joel. All the nations of the earth are assembled to fight against Jerusalem, the rulers and inhabitants of Jerusalem are endowed with marvellous power; but the conflict is a terrible one; the Holy City is taken, and half of the people are taken into captivity. When things, however, have come to the worst, Jehovah appears with all His saints upon the Mount of Olives for the deliverance of His people. This day of decision is a day of terrible obscurity; but after the enemies, panic-stricken by God, have now also helped to exterminate each other, the light of redemption shall dawn on the evening of this last day of the present dispensation. Here again the thought is impressed that the Church will have to endure not merely a judicial sifting, like that announced by Malachi, ch. iii. 2, 19, to those of his contemporaries who were thirsting after an infliction of judgments upon the heathen, but an extremity of tribulation, in which it will seem to have perished. We close this survey of Old Testament prophecy concerning the judgment of the world, with Daniel's prophecy of the four kingdoms. According to ch. ii. and vii., the history of the world is to run its course in four kingdoms. The unity of these kingdoms, *i.e.* the fact that each of them represents the κόσμος as opposed to the kingdom of God, is pointed out in ch. ii. by the colossal image which these kingdoms together compose, in ch. vii. by the circumstance of their

Digitized by Google

successively arising from the ocean, tossed and disturbed by the four winds, the symbol of the storm-tossed heathen world. The worldly power is destroyed at a blow by the kingdom of God coming from heaven. We cannot here more particularly discuss these four kingdoms. Not to mention utterly untenable views, it will always be a matter of dispute whether to adopt the traditional interpretation, still advocated by Hengstenberg, Reichel, Hofmann, and others, which makes these to embrace the Chaldean, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman empires (5), or the now more usual one (of Delitzsch among others), which makes the fourth kingdom the Grecian, and explains the others variously, mostly, however, regarding the second as the Median, the third as the Persian. Of special importance, however, is that feature in these delineations of judgment, vii. 8, 11, 20 sq., 25, which represents the arrogance of the secular power and its hostility to the kingdom of God as at last concentrated in a king who, with a mouth speaking great things, blasphemes the Most High, and proceeds to destroy His worship and exterminate His saints, etc.; who then for a period obtains power over the saints of the Most High, until the final judgment takes place and involves him in destruction, vii. 22, 26, etc. That evil, too, will secretly come to maturity before the final judgment, is the thought which is here more distinctly expressed than formerly. Ch. xi. 6 sees a preliminary historical embodiment of this view in Antiochus Epiphanes; and thus the Maccabean persecution, which contributed to the purification of the people, becomes a type of the last tribulation of the church, xii. 1, which shall be such as never was since there was a nation, but which shall conduce to the purification and preservation of the church, ver. 10 (6).

(1) Mic. iv. 12: The heathen who rejoice over the fall of Zion "know not the thoughts of the Lord, neither understand His counsel, that He has gathered them as sheaves into the floor."

(2) For it is from Zion, according to Joel iii. 16, that the

Digitized by Google

roaring of the judgment proceeds. On the other hand, many expositors understand here the valley in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, which was rendered illustrious by the proceedings of King Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xx. (§ 179). This valley was, according to ver. 26 of the said chapter, called after this occurrence עֵמֶק בְּרָכָה (valley of blessing). The name יְהוֹשָׁפָט can, however, hardly be derived from King Jehoshaphat, but is symbolical; whence we find עֵמֶק הַחָרוּץ, Joel iii. 14.

(3) Only we must not, in this delineation of judgment with its local and geographical limitations, regard the prophet's meaning as merely allegorical. It is the Old Testament form of thought which is expressed in the New Testament, Matt. xxiv. 14, when it is declared that before the final judgment "the gospel of the kingdom must be preached in the whole *οἰκουμένη* for a *witness* unto all nations."

(4) It is assumed in this prophetic picture that Israel is again dwelling in the Holy Land.

(5) A view which, if we confine ourselves to ch. ii. and xii., may not only be justified, but also offers in every respect a more natural explanation of the separate details, but against which serious difficulties arise when we go further into the book.

(6) How far the last judgment extends to the dead also, and prophetic eschatology prepares the way for the doctrine of eternal condemnation, will be shown, § 226, in connection with the doctrine of the resurrection.

SECOND SUBDIVISION.

THE FUTURE REDEMPTION (1).

I. THE DELIVERANCE AND RESTORATION OF THE COVENANT PEOPLE.

§ 222.

The Restoration of Israel a Necessary Event.

The restoration of Israel, as before remarked, is not founded upon any claim that can be advanced by this people (2), *but solely*

Digitized by Google

upon the nature of their God as the Holy and the Faithful One. When Israel incurred the Divine judgment, the Divine purposes of redemption seemed to be frustrated. In the opinion of the heathen, and even of unbelievers in Israel itself, it was over with the nation; and if it was not also over with its God, He was still considered to have shown Himself to be a weak God. Thus the judgment upon Israel, which was to manifest Him to the heathen as the Holy One, had produced the opposite result. This is thus expressed, *e.g.* Ezek. xxxvi. 20 sq.: Israel being cast out among the heathen, profaned God's name among them, for they said, "These are the people of the Lord, and yet they are gone forth out of His land." Therefore, as ver. 22 sqq. further declares, Jehovah, to sanctify His great name, that the heathen may know Him to be the true God, must put a stop to judgment, and cancel the rejection of Israel. That which is here and in other passages (comp. Deut. xxxii. 27, Isa. xlviii. 9 sqq.) represented as an *event necessary to the preservation of God's honour*, appears elsewhere as rather the *result of His nature.* For the idea of God as the absolutely unchangeable Being requires, as was shown, Pt. I., that the people with whom He has entered into a covenant relation cannot perish; comp. especially the passage Mal. iii. 6, discussed § 39, with note 5. As Jehovah, He is the *Faithful One*, whose words of promise given to the fathers of the nation who found favour in His sight shall stand for ever, while all that is earthly shall perish, Isa. xl. 7 sq. (3). His faithfulness cannot be made void by the unfaithfulness of man. He has not given a writing of divorcement to the adulterous wife, for this is the meaning of the profound passage, Isa. l. 1 (4), already mentioned (§ 188) in another connection; and hence there is no need that He should renew the covenant relation. For *their iniquities* the people are sold, but He is able to overcome and do away with sin (Mic. vii. 18 sq. (5), Isa. xliii. 25). Nay, the Divine judgment of rejection is to have the effect of causing the whole power of the Divine love to shine forth (6); comp.

Digitized by Google

Jer. xxxi. 2 sq., 20, Hos. xi. 8 sq., Isa. xlix. 14 sqq. (7), liv. 7–10, and other passages. *But how does this love deliver?* How does it come to pass that Israel, though judged, is still delivered? that God's calling, which is to remain unchangeable, attains its end in this very nation, which has shown itself incapable of fulfilling its vocation? The answer is,—1. *God so arranges that a restoration of this nation is possible;* and 2. *He so restores the nation as to make it a fit instrument for the accomplishment of His purposes of redemption* (8).

(1) The future redemption is represented as embracing,—1. *The deliverance and restoration of the rejected covenant people,* in which even the just who have fallen asleep are to participate by the *resurrection.* 2. The *introduction* of those *heathen* who have been saved from judgment *into the kingdom of God* by means of the restored covenant people. 3. The prophecies concerning redemption culminate in the appearance of Messiah.

(2) See the proof of this in Div. II. § 202.

(3) Isa. xl. 7 sq.: "Surely the people is grass: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand for ever."

(4) Isa. l. 1: "Thus saith the Lord, Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement whom I have put away? or which of my creditors is it to whom I have sold you? Behold, for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves, and for your transgressions is your mother put away." The first half of the verse is explained by the law, Deut. xxiv. 3 sq. (§ 104. 2). This law certainly applies to Israel, inasmuch as repudiated Israel could not, see Jer. iii. 1, of its own power restore the covenant relation. But to God such restoration was not impossible, for it was not He but Israel that had cancelled the covenant. Neither had He given up His claim upon the nation He had rejected.

(5) Mic. vii. 18 sq.: "Who is a God like unto Thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of His heritage?" (for those are the acts which manifest God's incomparableness). "He retaineth not His anger for ever, because He delighteth in mercy. He will turn again, He will have compassion upon us, He will subdue our ini-

Digitized by Google

quities; and Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea." (Comp. § 202.)

(6) Compare how, as remarked, Pt. I. (§ 29), the first breach of the covenant on the part of the people, Ex. xxxiv. 6 sq., led to the first disclosure of the grace and compassion of God.

(7) The people, exiled and wandering, take with them as a legacy the saying, Jer. xxxi. 2 sq.: "I have loved thee with an everlasting love, therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee." Hos. xi. 8 sq.: "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee, Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zeboim?" (*i.e.* utterly exterminate thee). "Mine heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together," etc. (comp. § 44). Isa. xlix. 14 sqq.: "Zion said, The Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me. Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee."

(8) We shall proceed to furnish further proof of these propositions.

§ 223.

The שְׁאֵרִית יַעֲקֹב. *The New Covenant an everlasting one. The Forgiveness of Sins. The Outpouring of the Spirit.*

1. *God's judgments have a purpose, and therefore a measure*, as taught by Isaiah in the profound parable, ch. xxviii. 24 sqq. (1), already quoted § 90. When God inflicts judgments on the covenant people, His motive is not to annihilate them, like Sodom and Gomorrha, but to correct them with judgment (יִסֵּר בְּמִשְׁפָּט), Jer. x. 24, xxx. 11, *i.e.* in due measure, Isa. xxvii. 8 (according to the probable explanation of בְּסַאסְאָהּ), which measure is imposed by the Divine holiness; see as chief passage, Hos. xi. 8 sq. (2). According to this measure, judgment is so inflicted upon Israel that they are preserved therein. But how, it may be asked, is this possible? And here we

Digitized by Google

meet with the important prophetic doctrine of the שְׁאֵרִית יַעֲקֹב (שְׁאָר יַעֲקֹב, etc.). While the mass of the nation became rebellious, individuals maintained their fidelity, like the seven thousand in the kingdom of the ten tribes who in Elijah's time had not bowed the knee to Baal, 1 Kings xix. 18. In these faithful ones, this *ecclesia invisibilis* of the old covenant, we have a pledge that the people of God do not perish; comp. as chief passage, Isa. viii. 17 sq., where Isaiah brings forward himself and his sons as signs and examples in the sense here designated (3). The intercession of these servants of God procures a longer exemption from judgment for the people; comp. *e.g.* Amos vii. 1–6. But even when they can effect nothing further, Jer. xvi. 1, the just must themselves be preserved, Ezek. xiv. 14–20: it must be verified in them that the just lives through his faith, Hab. ii. 4 (4). Though Israel be sifted among all nations as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall no corn fall to the earth, according to the well-known passage, Amos ix. 9 (5). Or though Israel, according to another image, be felled like a tree, there still remains for a stock "a holy seed," Isa. vi. 13 (6). For the sake of this seed of His servants, God will not exterminate Israel; comp. as chief passage, Isa. lxv. 8 sq. This remnant, exclaims Isaiah, ch. x. 21, shall return, this remnant of Jacob, to the mighty God (7). This remnant is, as Zeph. iii. 12 says, a humble and poor people, who trust in the name of the Lord. Comp. also the שְׁאֵרִית of Mic. ii. 12, v. 6, Jer. xxiii. 3. Thus is Israel preserved in the midst of judgment; judgment effects the sifting of the people.

2. In this restored remnant, the stock of the new church, the Divine counsel is to attain its end, and that for ever. *The new covenant is everlasting.* "I will betroth thee to me for ever," Hos. ii. 21. It is, Isa. liv. 8 sq., with an everlasting kindness, as unalterable as the Noachian covenant, that the Lord has mercy on His people; nay, though the mountains depart and the hills be removed, *i.e.* though all that is most stable be overthrown, this covenant of peace shall not be

Digitized by Google

removed; comp. Jer. xxxi. 35–37, l. 5, Isa. xli. 8, Ezek. xvi. 60, and other passages. And what is the pledge of this stability? The fact that in the new covenant God does not merely demand but *effects that nature in His people in virtue of which they are now fitted for their vocation* (8). This restoration of the people does not indeed take place in a magical manner; it becomes possible on their part through deep repentance for former sins, and a zealous return to their God, Deut. xxx. 2; comp. especially (with regard to the ten tribes) Jer. xxxi. 19. Hence it is that, when the Divine summons penetrates the lands of their captivity, the rejected ones hasten with trembling, lest their deliverance should be delayed, Hos. xi. 10 sq. (iii. 5), and return with weeping and supplications, Jer. xxxi. 9, l. 4 sq. The Divine *forgiveness* corresponds with the repentance of the people, and is complete. The adulteress becomes the bride of God, as though she had never been unfaithful, "like a wife of youth," Isa. liv. 6; "that thou mayest never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all thou hast done, saith the Lord God," Ezek. xvi. 63. The fact that God thus restores the people to the same relation to Himself, is *their righteousness from Him*, צִדְקָתָם מֵאִתִּי, Isa. liv. 17, δικαιοσύνη ἐκ Θεοῦ. This state of grace of the redeemed church is maintained against all their accusers: every tongue, it is said in the same verse, that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. Thus the people are all righteous (צַדִּיקִים), Isa. lx. 21. But this righteousness of grace, which thus abolishes sin, becomes also a *righteousness of life*, a new vital principle being implanted in the church by the *outpouring of the Divine Spirit*. The new church is a spiritual church, comp. Isa. xliv. 3, lix. 21, Ezek. xxxix. 29. Even in the Old Testament theocracy, the guidance of the Holy Spirit was given, Isa. lxiii. 11 (9), but His guidance was the prerogative of the organs of the theocracy, especially of the prophets, and then certainly of the pious in general. But such guidance was effected only by an influence and not by an

Digitized by Google

indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and even in the prophets this influence was an extraordinary endowment (§ 65, 204). The church of the future, on the contrary, is founded upon an outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh, Joel ii. 28 sq. בָּל־בָּשָׂר is not indeed the whole world of mankind, the *πᾶσα σάρξ* of John xvii. 2; but it is declared, by the enumeration which follows of sons and daughters, old men and young men, servants and handmaids, that no age or station is excluded from the possession of the Spirit. Indeed, this outpouring of the Spirit is represented as causing all to prophesy. That direct personal communion with God which is effected by the Spirit, and which afforded the prophets an insight into the Divine counsels, is to become the common possession of all members of the church; and thus is to be fulfilled that desire of Moses, expressed Num. xi. 29 (§ 65, note 2). With this agree also the passages Jer. xxxi. 34, where it is said of the church of the new covenant, "They shall no more teach every man his neighbour, . . . saying, Know the Lord," etc. (§ 209); and Isa. liv. 13: "All thy children shall be לִמּוּדֵי יְהוָה, the taught of the Lord." This teaching of God under the new covenant, confirmed as it is by the passages John vi. 45, 1 John ii. 20, 27, which again take up these prophetic utterances, has, as is notorious, been explained by fanatics as excluding human instruction, and abolishing a learned order in the church of the new covenant. But these passages are not intended to do away with human means for obtaining a knowledge of saving truth, but to proclaim the independence of human authority enjoyed by each member of the church with respect to his assurance of salvation. They promise that Divine truth shall be directly testified to by the Holy Spirit in each member of this church. Hengstenberg, on Jer. xxxi. 34, very aptly refers in elucidation to 2 Cor. iii. 3, where the *διακονία*, which brings about an appropriation of salvation, is expressly assumed (10). This impartation of the Holy Spirit, besides communicating a vital knowledge of God, purifies the heart and creates

Digitized by Google

a readiness to fulfil the Divine will, Ezek. xxxvi. 25–27, Jer. xxxi. 33 (11). And thus the end of Old Testament pedagogy is attained; the holy people of God are also a subjectively holy church.

(1) Isa. xxviii. 24 sqq.: As the farmer does not always plough, but also sows, does not always thresh and so destroy the corn, but only so far as is required for obtaining bread, so does God proceed as Judge.

(2) Comp. the treatment of the passage in the discussion of the Idea of the Divine Holiness (§ 48. 1, with note 4).

(3) In Isa. viii. 17, the prophet contrasts himself and his sons with the rebellious nation, which for its contempt of God's word is to be exposed to the approaching judgments of utter helplessness and hopelessness: "I wait for the Lord, that hideth His face from the house of Jacob, and hope in Him. *Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me for signs and examples in Israel*, from the Lord of Hosts which dwelleth in Mount Zion." The sign is seen by many only in the symbolic names of Isaiah and his sons. This is not to be excluded; but still the main thought is, that they were themselves *personally* such signs and examples.

(4) As it was verified to Jeremiah, to whom the Divine word went forth, xxxix. 18, at the destruction of Jerusalem: "Thy life shall be for a prey unto thee, because thou hast put thy trust in me."

(5) Amos ix. 8 sq.: "Behold, the eyes of the Lord God are upon this sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the Lord. (The sinful *kingdom*, the kingdom of Samaria, is to be destroyed, but this is by no means a destruction of the *house* of Israel.) For lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth."

(6) Isa. vi. 12 sq.: The Lord removes the men, "and great is the forsaking in the midst of the land. And if there is therein still a tenth, yet shall this also be consumed." But, continues the prophet, "as a teil tree, and as an oak, in which, when they are felled, a stock remains; the holy seed is their stock."

Digitized by Google

(7) Isa. x. 21: שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב שְׁאָר יַעֲקֹב אֶל־אֵל־גִּבּוֹר. Isaiah called one of his own sons שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב, comp. vii. 3, for a testimony against the ungodly and secure, who expected the deliverance of the entire nation, and for the comfort of the godly.

(8) Comp. what is said on Jer. xxxi. 34, in § 202.

(9) Isa. lxiii. 11: הַשָּׂם בְּקִרְבּוֹ אֶת־רוּחַ קָדְשׁוֹ.

(10) 2 Cor. iii. 3: "Ye are an epistle of Christ ministered by us (*διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν*), written not with ink, but with the *Spirit* of the living God; not on tables of stone, but on fleshy tables of the heart."

(11) Jer. xxxi. 33: "I will put my law in their heart," etc. See what has already been said on this passage, § 202.

§ 224.

Other Features of the Times of Redemption.

The other features of the times of redemption are, according to prophetic intuition, the following:—

1. *The return of the people to the Holy Land, and the restoration of Jerusalem.* This point, recurring as it does in almost every prophecy of redemption, needs no special references (§ 23, note 3). The possession of the Holy Land is declared to be a perpetual one, from Joel iv. 20 and Amos ix. 15 onwards (1), with increase of territory, Obad. 17 sqq. (2).

2. *The reunion of the twelve tribes.* It would be a grievous misfortune for the nation that one tribe of Israel should be lost, comp. Judg. xxi. 3, 6; and the disruption of the theocracy was a consequence and a punishment of sin (3). Hence there can be no complete redemption for Israel without the reunion of the ten tribes and of Judah under one head; see Hos. ii. 2, iii. 5, Isa. xi. 13 (4). This point is, however, most fully treated in the prophecy of Ezekiel, xxxvii. 15–22, where the matter is presented in a visible manner by the symbolical act of joining two sticks, which were probably formed from the trunk of a vine split lengthwise (5).

3. By reason of the causal connection between sin and *evil*,

Digitized by Google

the restoration of the people being a deliverance from sin, is at the same time the abolition of evil in all respects—*an abolition of all the troubles of life.* The ordinances of the ancient theocracy were calculated to exhibit an outwardly consecrated nation, —to make the people conscious, in virtue of that pedagogy of the law which pointed from the external to the internal,—by its demands of an outward purity, of their need of the sanctification of the inner man (§ 84). Now, however, the process was reversed,—the sanctification of the inner life effected by the Holy Spirit was to press outwards, and manifest itself in a perfect purification and consecration of even the most ordinary affairs of life. Thus, to give a few examples, the difficult passage Jer. xxxi. 38 sqq. so describes the boundaries of the New Jerusalem, that all the unclean places of the ancient city are now sacred places (6). So, too, Zech. xiv. 20 sq. expresses the thought that holiness is to penetrate even to that which is most external; that while, under the sway of sin, all that was sacred was profaned, now, on the contrary, all that was profane shall be sacred. In that day קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה (the inscription on the high priest's diadem) shall stand even upon the bells of the horses, nay, the very cooking utensils in Jerusalem shall be holy (7). Among the troubles of life so frequently summed up in the Old Testament as the four chief evils (§ 89, note 5) which shall be abolished, *war* is especially mentioned. All weapons are to be destroyed, Isa. ii. 5, Mic. v. 4–10, Zech. ix. 10, etc.; the new church is unapproachable in its protected retirement, Mic. vii. 14; the new city of God is no more to be desecrated by enemies, Joel iii. 17. Peace is also to pervade *nature.* The harmony between it and man, which, according to Gen. iii., comp. § 72. 2, was disturbed by sin, is to be restored; the Holy Land is to be glorified, and a fountain of life to proceed from the temple, Joel iii. 18, Ezek. xlvii. 6 sqq. (8). Every blessing of heaven and earth is to be poured out upon the favoured people; all that can harm them is to be done away with; comp. such descriptions as Hos. ii. 18 (9), 23 sq., Amos ix.

Digitized by Google

13 sq., Ezek. xxxiv. 25 sqq., etc. The nature of the wild beasts is to be changed, Isa. xi. 6–8 (10), comp. lxv. 25. But in all these pictures of the days of redemption we always perceive that such external renovation presupposes deliverance from sin and inward renewal. Thus Isa. xi., after describing the peace which is to prevail in the animal world, continues in ver. 9: "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea" (11).

(1) Joel iii. 20: "Judah shall dwell for ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation." Amos ix. 15: "I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them."

(2) How differently would the prophets have spoken if they had regarded Canaan and Jerusalem in a merely allegorical sense!

(3) We have already (§ 92, note 1) spoken of the fact that the number of twelve tribes was essential to the normal condition of the theocracy.

(4) Isaiah announces, xi. 13, that in the times of redemption "the envy of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah be cut off."

(5) Ezek. xxxvii. 15–22. The prophet writes upon one stick, "For Judah and the children of Israel associated with him;" upon the other, "For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim and the whole house of Israel associated with him,"—and presses the two sticks together in his hand. The meaning of this act is stated ver. 21: "Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."

(6) Jer. xxxi. 38 sqq., it is said that at the rebuilding of Jerusalem the measuring line should go forth as far as the hill Gareb (*i.e.* of the leper), and turn towards Goath (probably,

Digitized by Google

as Hengstenberg thinks, from נָוַת, to depart, to decease; then perhaps the place of execution); and the whole valley of the dead bodies and of the ashes, and all the Sheremoth, to the brook of Kidron (certainly identical with the שְׁדֵמוֹת קִדְרוֹן, the fields of Kidron, 2 Kings xxiii.; these were, according to ver. 4, defiled by Josiah, who burned in them all the abominations of idolatry), were to be holy to the Lord. This has certainly a symbolical meaning, but must not be regarded, as by Hengstenberg (*Christol.* sec. 2, p. 498), as being in the intention of the prophet only an image of the triumph of God's kingdom over the world.

(7) It is further said, Zech. xiv. 20 sq., that the pots in the Lord's house shall be like the bowls before the altar; and every pot in Jerusalem and Judah shall be holiness for the Lord of Hosts, and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them and seethe therein. In the Mosaic worship the pots in the temple were less holy than the bowls, for the laity sacrificed in the former, while the priest sprinkled the sacrificial blood with the latter. This distinction is now abolished, as is also the distinction between vessels for worship and for secular purposes, because all the relations of life are now equally hallowed by God.

(8) Ezek. xlvii. 6 sqq.: Waters issue forth from the threshold of the temple in the east; these waters run into the Dead Sea, and make its waters wholesome. (See Neumann, *Das Wasser des Lebens ein exeget. Versuch über Ezek.* xlvii. 1–12, 1848.)

(9) Hos. ii. 18: The Lord makes in that day a covenant with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and the creeping things of the ground, that they shall not hurt Israel.

(10) Isa. xi. 6 sq.: "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, . . . and the lion shall eat straw like the ox." This description must not be regarded, as by older theologians, as mere allegory.

(11) Comp. Isa. xxxiii. 24: "The inhabitant shall not say, I am sick: the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity."

Digitized by Google

§ 225.

Death destroyed.

The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, in which the penalty inflicted on mankind for sin culminates. The voice of weeping shall be no more heard in the New Jerusalem (Isa. lxv. 19). Yet in this very passage, vers. 20–23, human life is only supposed to be of greater extent, perhaps of such as Genesis ascribes to primeval times. "There shall be no more an infant who attains but a few days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: he that dies at a hundred years dies a youth, and a sinner is carried off at a hundred years, and men are to live as long as trees." Here, then, a *limitation of the power of death* is spoken of, and sin is assumed to be still possible. On the other hand, prophecy rises in some passages to a declaration of *the annihilation of death, and of a resurrection of the dead* (1). To understand, however, the *position of this announcement in the doctrinal system of the Old Testament*, we must deal more particularly with the subject. The ultimate grounds on which the prophetic doctrine of the resurrection rests are, *first*, the knowledge of the *living God*, who has power even over death and the regions of the dead, Deut. xxxii. 39, 1 Sam. ii. 6 (2); and proves that He has this power in those cases in which He recalls the dead to life at the request of His prophets. It depends, *secondly*, upon the importance of *human personality*, which is called to communion with God (see § 79). Still it is not of the vanquishing of death in the cases of individuals that prophecy chiefly treats, but of the eternal duration of the church. This is guaranteed by the eternity of God, who is an inexhaustible source of life even to His perishing people (Isa. xl. 28 sqq.). When the heavens wax old as doth a garment, and are changed as a vesture, He remains *the same*, and therefore the seed of His servants shall outlast these changes of the universe (Ps. cii. 27 sqq.). And this very fact, that the Church rises again in

Digitized by Google

renewed vigour after apparent destruction, is also represented as her resurrection from death. This is done first in two passages of Hosea, viz. vi. 2 and xiii. 14. In the former, the people are introduced as turning to God in their hour of need, and saying, though still in a hesitating manner, "After two days He will *revive* us, in the third" (*i.e.* after a short delay) "He will *raise us up*, and we shall live before Him." That which is here expressed as the hope of the people, the fulfilment of which cannot be promised in their present state of inconstancy, appears in the second passage as a saying of God. The very variously understood train of ideas from ver. 12 onwards is as follows: The afflictions of Israel are to be the pangs by which a new nation shall be born. But the people will not suffer this to come to pass. "They are as an unwise son; when the time is come, he does not enter the place of the breaking forth of children." The anxiety for both mother and child, when the birth will not take place, forms the transition to ver. 14: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death. O death, where are thy plagues? O grave, where is thy destruction?" As much as to say, And yet this people have a God who is capable of delivering them from even such a state of death, because the powers of death cannot prevail against Him (3). Since, however, the people resist their deliverance, it is also added that the storm of judgment shall sweep them away. Hence the victory over death here spoken of is merely hypothetical, and assumed to pertain to the church in general (4).

(1) Comp. my *Commentationes ad theol. bibl. pertinentes*, p. 42 sqq., and my article *Unsterblichkeit, Lehre des A. T.*, in Herzog's *Realencyclop.* xxi. p. 416 sqq. Prophecy confirms the old doctrine of Sheol, as appears from the passages formerly given (§ 78 sq.).

(2) Deut. xxxii. 39: "I kill, and I make alive." 1 Sam. ii. 6: "The Lord killeth, and maketh alive; He bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up."

Digitized by Google

(3) According, indeed, to another explanation (so Simson, and an article in the *Zeitschr. für Protest. und Kirche*, 1854, xxviii. p. 124), Hos. xiii. 14 would have an entirely different meaning, its first sentence being regarded as a question: "Should I ransom them from the power of death?" the second as an expression of God's extreme wrath with the people, against whom death and hell are summoned ("Come with all your powers of destruction"). But such an explanation of the first sentence is as unnatural as it is improbable that אֶהְיֶה is to be understood otherwise than in ver. 5. I rejoice to find that Keil has returned to the old interpretation.

(4) The saying, however, points significantly to an actual conquest of death and the region of the dead; hence its citation, 1 Cor. xv. 55.

§ 226.

Continuation.

The following considerations will show the *further progress of this doctrine.* When Israel is restored and glorified in its remnant delivered out of judgments, one enigma will nevertheless remain unsolved. The just shall live by his faith, Hab. ii. 2; hence, when judgment is inflicted, all the just are, according to Ezek. ix. 4, to be distinguished by a mark from the multitudes who are delivered up to the destroying angels (1). And yet the same prophet, xxi. 3, 8 sq., beholds the fire of judgment consuming both green trees and dry, the sword of the Lord slaying both the righteous and the wicked. Where, then, is the God of righteousness? This contradiction, in which the Divine righteousness seems involved, is in some degree mitigated by the consideration that God takes the righteous to their rest, that they may not experience the troubles about to be inflicted, Isa. lvii. 1 sq.: "He enters into peace; they rest in their beds who walked straight onwards" (thus King Josiah, 2 Kings xxii. 20). But this does not solve the enigma. Its full solution can only be furnished by the

Digitized by Google

participation of the righteous who have departed in faith in the promises of God, the redemption of their nation, and the consummation of that kingdom of God for which they waited. And here the prophecy Isa. xxvi. comes in. The prophet had already, in xxv. 8, declared, when speaking of the times of redemption, that the Lord would for ever annihilate death, and wipe away tears from all faces. This implied, in the first place, only the abolition of death for the church of that period; but in xxvi. 19 the prophecy goes further. The train of ideas in this variously explained portion is, from ver. 13 onwards, as follows (2):—The people formerly served other gods, not, as many explain it, other human lords; this idolatrous generation is judged, and will not rise again from the dead. Jehovah has again increased the nation, but its full redemption, by means of the travail pains it is enduring, has not yet come. The inhabitants of the world "will not be born," *i.e.*, according to the context, wrested from the realm of the dead (3). Hence the wish, ver. 19, that the dead of God (4), the corpses of the people, may arise; which wish quickly passes into the summons, "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs" (or, according to others, of the light); *i.e.*, as dew revives the herbage, so does the power of God revive thee, and the earth brings forth the shades. Till then the people are to wait quietly. On the day of the final judgment for which the Lord arises (ver. 21), the earth discloses her blood, and no more covers her slain (5); these being, according to the most probable explanation, awakened to new life, obtain their justification. That the resurrection (ver. 19) must not here be regarded as typical (as though only the deliverance of the people of God from their troubles were intended), is evident from the contrast in ver. 12 and the whole context (6). Advancing to still later prophecy, we first meet with Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones, ch. xxxvii. (7). The prophet is led in the Spirit into a valley filled with dry bones. To the Lord's question, "Son of man, will these bones live?"

Digitized by Google

he replies, "Lord God, Thou knowest;" thus declaring the matter to be beyond human knowledge. He then receives the command to prophesy over the bones, ver. 4 sq. (8). A noise is now heard, and there is a shaking (9); next follows a reanimation by means of the before designated acts, the bones first approaching each other and becoming covered with sinews and flesh, and then the breath of life coming from the four winds into these slain, when they stand up reanimated, an exceeding great army. "These bones," it is now said, vers. 11–14, "are the whole house of Israel (10). Behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel; then ye shall know that I am the Lord: and I will put my Spirit in you that you may live, and I will place you in your own land," etc. From the days of the fathers to the most recent expositors, it has been disputed whether the description in vers. 1–10 is to be understood literally of the resurrection of the dead, or symbolically of the restoration of the covenant people (11). According to the former view, it is not the explanation but only the application of the vision that is given in vers. 11–14 (12), which are said, as Calovius already understood the passage, to bring forward the analogy existing between the restoration of Israel and the future resurrection of the dead. But the simple meaning of the words requires that we should regard these verses as the *explanation* of the preceding vision; and since at least ver. 11 ("these bones are the whole house of Israel"), which declares the condition of Israel to be that of dry bones, must be symbolically understood, it seems quite arbitrary to take ver. 12, where it is declared to those who have said, Our bones are dried, "I will open your graves," etc., literally. In any case, however, the vision is of the greatest importance in the development of the doctrine of the resurrection, which, though not resulting there-

Digitized by Google

from as its direct explanation, is yet implied by its obvious application. Tertullian had already justly remarked concerning this passage: *de vacuo similitudo non competit; de nullo parabola non convenit.* That the power of God *can*, against all human thought and hope, reanimate the dead, is the general idea of the passage, from which consequently the hope of a literal resurrection of the dead may naturally be inferred, though the context shows that this is not what is here spoken of. The resurrection of the dead is, however, decidedly taught in Dan. xii. In ver. 1 the prophet foretells "a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation;" and continues: "At that time every one that is found written in the book" (*i.e.* the book of life) "shall be delivered, and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt; and they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." Then it is said to Daniel, ver. 13, "Go thou thy way till the end; for thou shalt rest, and rise to thy lot at the end of the days." According to the connection of xii. 3 with xi. 33, 35, the promise of a resurrection to life (comp. Isa. xxvi. 19) is made especially with reference to those who have maintained their fidelity to God by a confessor's death. The expression "many," however, must not be taken in a partial sense (13). It is not used in opposition to those who do not rise, but merely as expressing a great number (14). The resurrection of the *ungodly* first appears in Daniel, though the transition to it is formed by Isa. lxvi. 24. When it is there said of the corpses of the rebels, whom the Lord has punished by fire and sword (ver. 16), that they lie outside the city of God, suffering eternal torments, "their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh," it is evidently assumed that the corpses are still endued with sensation. In the passage in Daniel, xii. 2, the word דִּרָאוֹן is used, which occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament except

Digitized by Google

in the passage in Isaiah; hence it is not improbable that the passage in Daniel refers to that in Isaiah. Daniel is speaking only of a resurrection of Israel, not of that of *all* men; the latter not being expressly mentioned in the Old Testament, though an allusion to it might be found in the formerly discussed passage (§ 199), Isa. xxiv. 22, where, as this obscure saying may be more particularly understood, a bringing forth of the kings still confined in the pit (*i.e.* in the region of the dead) is spoken of, while, on the other side, it is said of the Chaldeans in Jer. li. 39, 57, that they should sleep a perpetual sleep and not wake. These are, however, expressions which can scarcely be urged to establish a doctrine.

(1) Ezekiel most emphatically declares, ch. xviii., that every one shall be recompensed according to his righteousness.

(2) Isa. xxvi. 8–12: The prophet expresses, in the name of the righteous, their desire for the day when God's judgments shall fall upon the sinful world, that sinners may at length behold the greatness of the Lord and His zeal for His people. They desire, however, that He may send redemption to His people.

(3) תַּפִּיל in ver. 19 shows the proper sense of the word יַפִּלוּ in Isa. xxvi. 18, which has been the occasion of a very strange explanation, especially by Hengstenberg. Undoubtedly נֵפֶל is not *birth* in general, but *miscarriage*. The expression, however, implies a violent wresting. The event does not take place in the ordinary course of nature: the dead must be torn by force from the world below, and this the people were not capable of effecting.

(4) For thus must מֵתַי be understood (see Böttcher, *de inferis*, § 445), in opposition to the dead of the rebellious generation.

(5) The connection with what precedes makes it probable that by הֲרוּגִים, in Isa. xxvi. 21, we must understand God's dead ones, mentioned ver. 18, whose blood, having been till now unavenged, is thus placed on a level with the blood of one put to death for his sins.

(6) Even ver. 21 does not signify merely that those who

Digitized by Google

have been put to death when innocent are to be avenged of their enemies at the last judgment.

(7) The occasion of the vision in Ezek. xxxvii. is alluded to in ver. 11. The people were so weakened that they considered a restoration, such as the prophet announced in ch. xxxvi., absolutely inconceivable. It was to encounter this despair that the revelation was accorded to the prophet.

(8) Ezek. xxxvii. 4 sq.: "Ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord. Behold, I will cause breath (רוּחַ) to enter into you, that ye may live: and I will lay sinews upon you, and will bring up flesh upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, that ye may live, and ye shall know that I am the Lord."

(9) According to Hitzig and Kliefoth, an earthquake (LXX. σεισμός), which it is, however, purely arbitrary to identify with that of xviii. 19, in which the power of Gog is destroyed.

(10) *I.e.*, according to the connection with ver. 5, the nation of Judah as well as that of the ten tribes.

(11) By which some understand merely the revival of Israel from civil death to a new political existence, others its restoration from spiritual death, its spiritual revival,—a difference which is reconciled by the fact that, according to xxxvi. 27 sq., and xxxvii. 21 sqq., the restoration of Israel as the people of God under the rule of the Messiah, of a truly sanctified community, is treated of. After the almost exclusive adoption of the symbolical meaning in recent times, Hitzig and Kliefoth have again revived the literal acceptation.

(12) Kliefoth, in his Commentary, i. p. 370, calls it "a consolatory address based upon the matter of the vision, and applying it to a definite point."

(13) According to the accentuation, the מִן before מִיְּשֵׁנֵי is dependent not upon רַבִּים but יִקְיצוּ.

(14) See especially Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. p. 314, and *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 2, 1st ed. p. 549, 2d ed. p. 598.

Digitized by Google

II. THE ADMISSION OF THE HEATHEN INTO THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

§ 227.

The Extension of the Kingdom of God in the Times of Redemption.

The opposition of the heathen world to the purposes of the kingdom of God, is annulled by the destructive judgment inflicted on it. But this judgment is to have also a positive result. When it is over, says Zeph. iii. 9, "I will turn to the people clean lips" (for their lips had been hitherto polluted by the invocation of idols), "that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one shoulder" (*i.e.* bear the same yoke). As, however, Israel is to be restored only in its sifted remnant, so also it is only the *remnant* of the heathen rescued from judgment who do homage to the Lord. כָּל־הַנּוֹתָר: it is said, Zech. xiv. 16, "Every one that is left of all the nations," these shall go up to worship before the Lord, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles. This thought is carried out by the prophets with respect also to a series of individual nations, viz. those who have shown themselves most hostile towards Israel, nay, whose reception among the covenant people was in Old Testament times forbidden by the law, Deut. xxiii. 4 (§ 82. 3). Comp. *e.g.* the predictions of Jeremiah concerning heathen nations—Moab, ch. xlviii. (1); and Ammon, xlix. 6; also the prophecy concerning the remnant of the Philistines, Zech. ix. 7 (וְנִשְׁאַר גַּם הוּא לֵאלֹהֵינוּ). To the intuition of the *older* prophets, this enlargement of the kingdom of God by the admission of the heathen is first of all *an extension of the theocracy* as it existed under David and Solomon, when heathen nations were subject to the sceptre of the theocratic king. This is shown particularly in the passage Amos ix. 11 sq.: "In that

Digitized by Google

day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen upon whom my name is named, saith the Lord that doeth this" (2). According to a now widely-diffused explanation (Hitzig), the last words are said to signify: upon whom my name was once called, *i.e.* as that of their conqueror. But the expression: The name of the Lord is named upon a people, never denotes this external possession by Him, but always a relation of internal fellowship; comp. such passages as Deut. xxviii. 9 sq. (§ 56, note 4); and hence the *perfectum* נִקְרָא must be taken as the *futurum exactum*, as a declaration of the position these nations will enter into with respect to the kingdom of God. (The admission, however, of the heathen nations into the kingdom of God is here expressed in a quite indefinite manner, the historical horizon of this prophet being still limited.) On the other hand, we are placed upon the high places of prophetic intuition in the descriptions of the latter days given Isa. ii. 2–4, and Mic. iv. 1–4. All nations are going to Zion, which is spiritually elevated above all the mountains of the world, to receive there the Divine law as the rule of their lives, while universal peace prevails under the rule of Jehovah (3). But it is especially in the Book Isaiah, xl.–lxvi., that the mission of Israel as the servant of the Lord, to be the medium of revelation to all mankind, forms one of the fundamental thoughts. The עֶבֶד יְהוָה is Israel as the covenant people, xli. 8 sq., xliv. 1 sqq., comp. Jer. xxx. 10, xlvi. 27 sq., and indeed in a twofold aspect: On the one hand, the nation as it actually appeared, the blind and deaf servant of the Lord, seeing many things but observing not, having open ears but hearing not, and for such unfaithfulness incurring judgment, and falling into a state of utter ruin, Isa. xlii. 18–25; on the other, the servant is Israel according to its ideal, as a nation true to its Divine calling (comp. Ps. xxiv. 6: Jacob = the generation of those

Digitized by Google

who seek God's face), and in this respect differing from the nation as it actually appeared, though at the same time one with it. The figure, moreover, represents first the servants of God collectively, that שְׁאֵרִית יַעֲקֹב (§ 223. 1) from which the holy seed proceeds (see especially Isa. lxv. 8 sq.) which is to form the stock of the new church, and then culminates in an individual (see § 233). This servant, the ideal Israel, is accordingly called, according to xlii. 4, to establish judgment in the earth, and the isles wait for his law. He is the light of the Gentiles, ver. 6; through him the salvation of the Lord is to penetrate to the end of the earth, xlix. 6, comp. with li. 5. In these passages, as well as in ii. 2–4, it is to be remarked that the kingdom of God is now no longer to be extended, as in older prophecy, by force of arms, but by the *word*. While darkness still covers the earth, and gross darkness the nations, the glory of the Lord arises upon Zion, and nations and kings then walk in this light, ch. lx., etc. The new temple in Jerusalem is thus called a house of prayer for all nations, lvi. 7. The latter passage, lvi. 3–7, is also worthy of notice in another respect (4). It has already been remarked that the law, Deut. xxiii. 4, which excluded certain nations from the theocracy, was abrogated to prophetic intuition. But here the law, Deut. xxiii. 2, which excluded eunuchs from the kingdom of God, is also abolished, while that in ver. 3 of the same chapter, by which no מַמְזֵר was admitted into the church, is annulled (§ 82. 2) by Zech. ix. 6.

In this consummation of redemption, the theocratic relation in which Jehovah in Old Testament times stood to Israel, is transferred to all mankind. The Lord has become the King of all nations, Zech. xiv. 16 sq. (ver. 9), comp. with Isa. xxiv. 23, Ps. xcvi. 10, xcvii. 1 (Ps. xciii. 99, Obad. 21).

All the treasures of the world, all the most precious possessions of the Gentiles, now conduce to the glory of the Divine kingdom, and are used for the adornment of the city and temple of God, etc.; comp. what is already said, Isa. xxiii. 18,

Digitized by Google

with reference to restored Tyre, but especially Isa. lx. 9–11, and Hag. ii. 7, where Luther's beautiful translation, "*da soll dann kommen aller Heiden Trost*" (then shall the consolation of all the heathen come; A. V. "the desire of all nations"), is incorrect, the חֶמְדַּת כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם signifying, according to the connection with ver. 8, the precious things of all the nations of the world.

(1) Jer. xlviii. 42, it was said, "Moab shall be destroyed from being a people, because he hath magnified himself against the Lord;" but then, ver. 47, "I will bring again the captivity of Moab in the latter days."

(2) There is here a reference to the days of David, during which Israel ruled over the neighbouring nations, especially the *Edomites*. The latter afterwards profited by the decline of the kingdom of Judah to regain their independence. When, then, the judgment announced by the prophet in ch. i. has been inflicted, the שְׁאֵרִית of Edom is to be incorporated into the theocracy, together with all the nations upon whom the name of Jehovah is named.

(3) Mic. iv. 1–3: "In the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and the nations shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come and say, Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, that He may teach us of His ways, and we may walk in His paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And He shall judge between many nations, and arbitrate for strong nations afar off. Then shall they beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

(4) Isa. lvi. 3–7: "Let not the stranger that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from His people; neither let the *eunuch* say, Behold, I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the *eunuchs* that keep my Sabbaths and choose the things that please me, . . . To them will I give in my house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters;

Digitized by Google

I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off." It is further said by the prophet to all strangers who serve the Lord and love His name, that He will make them joyful in His house of prayer, that their burnt-offerings and sacrifices shall be accepted upon His altar, "*for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations.*"

§ 228.

The Conditions under which the Admission of the Heathen into the Kingdom of God is to take place.

The appearance of this kingdom of God which embraces all nations, is, however, as is evident from the passages quoted, combined, according to prophetic intuition, with the fact *that Israel is to remain the mediatory nation at the head of the nations*, and Jerusalem with its temple to form the central point of the kingdom to which the nations are to journey. The heathen now do homage to this once despised and ill-used people. To be called after Israel is now a title of honour, Isa. xliv. 5: the heathen shall fall down and surrender themselves as vassals to Israel, "for God is in thee, and there is none other God," xlv. 14, comp. with Mic. vii. 16 sq. and other passages (1). On the other hand, the incorporation of the heathen in the kingdom of God is in Ps. lxxxvii. represented as their acquisition of rights of citizenship in Jerusalem (2), to which also the passage Isa. lvi. 3 sq. (§ 227, note 4) refers. It is, moreover, worthy of remark, that in certain passages it is predicted that after the Jews have been restored to the Holy Land, and have allied themselves with the Gentiles, the latter will assist in bringing back those members of the covenant people who are still scattered in the world, and thus become instrumental in the complete restoration of Israel. This is contained in Isa. xi. 10 sqq., xiv. 1 sq., xlix. 22, and in Zeph. iii. 10, according to the probable interpretation: "My worshippers (subject) shall bring as an offering the daughters of my dispersion (object)

Digitized by Google

(my dispersed children, the members of the covenant people)." A similar prediction is also found in Isa. lxvi. 18–21, a passage which indeed signifies more, but whose most probable explanation must nevertheless be, that those heathen, preserved from the judgments inflicted on the nations, now go forth as Jehovah's messengers to all nations, to bring the brethren of the people as an offering to Jehovah; though the other explanation, that these messengers will bring as an offering the rest of the remnant of the heathen nations, as the brethren of God, is certainly admissible. The *rites of worship* in this future and enlarged kingdom of God are connected in respect of sacrifice and festival with the Old Testament ritual. It has already been shown in the Second Division (§ 201), that prophecy does not contemplate the abolition of sacrifice in the latter days. It will suffice here to call to mind that in the house of prayer for all nations, of Isa. lvi. 7, sacrifices are, according to the same passage, also offered; that lxvi. 23 declares that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, all flesh shall come to worship before the Lord, etc.; and that, according to Zech. xiv. 16–19, all nations must go up annually to keep the Feast of Tabernacles, which is here spoken of in its historical meaning, comp. § 156. Still there is no lack of prophetic passages in which the limitations of the Old Testament ritual are broken through. It is true, indeed, that those which have been generally claimed in support of this assertion are just those which do not decide the point, *e.g.* Isa. lxvi. 1–3: "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest? . . . He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood." Can this mean (says Umbreit) that there will be no temple in the New Jerusalem—that no sacrifice will be offered? How can such a fact be reconciled with lvi. 7, etc.? Nor does the passage mean (as Hitzig and Knobel understand

Digitized by Google

it) that the Lord will not suffer a temple to be built to Him in Babylon, for the context shows that these words are (as Delitzsch justly regards them) addressed to the rebellious and sinful mass of the people, who even in captivity were occupied with the thought of the future temple they purposed to build at Jerusalem. From them the Lord will accept no temple, and the more so that He really needs none, and that their sacrifices would only be the greatest abomination to Him. We have next to notice two other most remarkable prophetic passages, of which, on the contrary, the interpretation is more certain, and in which the connection with the place of worship in Jerusalem is dissolved. The first is Mal. i. 11, a passage quoted times without number by the Fathers, and claimed by Roman Catholic theologians as the chief passage in favour of the sacrifice of the mass. "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same," says the prophet to those Jews who dishonoured the Lord by their impure offerings, "my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name is great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts." According to an explanation defended by Hitzig, and even by Köhler, the passage refers to the times of the prophet, and is said to show that he regarded Ormuzd, Zeus, etc., as only different names of the one true God, of Jehovah, and therefore considered even heathen sacrifices as offered to Him. Such a view is from an Old Testament standpoint absolutely impossible (3). Every other, however, which refers this passage to the time then present is lost in a maze of subtleties. For it is only in appearance that the prophet, who transposes himself to those times when the Lord will be manifested among all the heathen, speaks of the present; and what is most remarkable in his words is that they predict a sacrificial service among all nations in all parts of the world. Side by side with this may be placed the famous prophecy concerning Egypt in Isa. xix., which speaks of a worship of Jehovah insti-

Digitized by Google

tuted not by Israelites but by Egyptians (4), and indeed in the land of Egypt. This worship is, moreover, also regarded in ver. 19 as sacrificial. This prophecy, however, goes still further; for at its close, ver. 23, it makes those very nations, viz. Assyria and Egypt, which represent the hostile secular powers, as in the latter days co-ordinate with Israel in the kingdom of God. "In that day there shall be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria (5), that Assyria may come to Egypt, and Egypt to Assyria; and Egypt shall serve (*sc.* Jehovah) with Assyria. In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the land, each of whom the Lord of Hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands (6), and Israel mine inheritance." Thus did the spirit of prophecy struggle to overcome particularism in its realization of the Divine purposes concerning the kingdom of God.

(1) See also Dan. vii. 27: "The kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High."

(2) Ps. lxxxvii. 3 sqq.: "Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God. I will proclaim Rahab (Egypt) and Babylon as those that know me; behold, Philistia and Tyre, with Ethiopia:" of each of the above-named nations it will be said, "This man was born there" (is inscribed in the register of births there kept). "And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her" (people from all nations); "and the Highest shall establish her. The Lord shall count, when He writeth up the people, that this man was born there."

(3) Besides, the honouring of God's *name* is spoken of, which always presupposes Divine revelation (§ 56).

(4) As though the prediction had been smuggled into the text of Isaiah (by Onias) in favour of the sanctuary at Leontopolis.

(5) The roads which had in Old Testament times so often been marched upon by conquerors, are now to serve for the peaceful intercourse of the nations admitted into the kingdom of God.

Digitized by Google

(6) It is worthy of remark that Assyria and Egypt here receive the same appellations which in the Old Testament express the special prerogatives of Israel.

III. THE MESSIAH (1).

§ 229.

Twofold View of the Consummation of Redemption. The Word מָשִׁיחַ. *The roots of the Messianic Hope in the Pentateuch.*

The consummation of redemption is, according to prophetic intuition, introduced on the one hand by the personal *coming* of *Jehovah* in His glory, but on the other by the coming of a *King of the race of David, the Messiah* (comp. § 216. 3). The former view prevails in a great number of passages. Jehovah appears, amidst the rejoicings of all creation, to set up His kingdom upon earth, Ps. xlvi. 10 sqq., xcviii. 7 sqq. He manifests Himself to His people as when in the ancient days, He brought them forth out of Egypt, as the Redeemer, the good Shepherd, who again takes into His own hand the conduct of His scattered sheep, whom He collects and brings back, Isa. xxxv. 4 sqq., xl. 10 sq., lii. 12, Ezek. xxxiv. 11 sqq., etc. It is *Jehovah Himself* who then takes up His dwelling upon Zion, and thence rules over all nations, Zech. xiv. 16, fills the new temple with His glory, Ezek. xliii. 2, 7, nay, shines as a constant light over the whole city of God, and protects it, iv. 5, as a fiery wall about it, Zech. ii. 9, etc. So substantial and appreciable will this future, compared with the former indwelling of God in His church, be, that the ark of the covenant will no longer be the vehicle of the Divine presence,—nay, it shall not even come to mind, because Jerusalem will have become the throne of God, Jer. iii. 16 sq. But while prophecy thus regards the communion into which God will in the times of redemption enter with His people as of the most direct possible kind, it on the other hand comparatively annuls this direct-

Digitized by Google

ness by another view, which runs parallel with the former. According to this view, a distinguished instrument of Jehovah, a *Son of David*, in whom Jehovah rules and blesses His people, is the medium by whom the consummation of redemption and the kingdom of God is brought to pass. The two views are placed in juxtaposition in Ezek. xxxiv. The Lord there declares Himself against the unfaithful shepherds of His people, who have suffered them to perish. He will, it is at first said in ver. 11 sqq., *Himself* undertake the care of the sheep. But then the prophecy turns directly in ver. 23 to the other view: "I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; for he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd." Then in ver. 24 the two views are thus connected: "I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them" (2). Now this son of David in whom Old Testament prophecy culminates is the Messiah. The word מָשִׁיחַ, LXX. *χριστός*, is used in the Old Testament first as the designation of every one anointed with the holy anointing oil, *e.g.* in the Pentateuch of the high priest (see § 96); then, anointing being the vehicle of spiritual gifts, symbolically, *e.g.* Ps. cv. 15, where it is applied equally with נְבִיא to the organs of revelation in general. But especially is "The Lord's anointed" the title of the theocratic king (§ 163); and on this account it became, chiefly by reason of the passages Ps. ii. 2, Dan. ix. 25, the proper name of that descendant of David who was to achieve complete redemption, and bring to its consummation the kingdom of God (3).

The Messianic hope had already struck root in a series of passages in the Pentateuch, hence our representation of the Messianic idea must start from these. It is true that the *πρῶτον εὐαγγέλιον* of Gen. iii. 15 (§ 19, with note 3) does not speak of the seed of the woman who is to bruise the serpent's head as an individual. The passage declares that the contest with evil, to which the human race is now

Digitized by Google

exposed, shall issue in the victory of the latter, though this shall not be obtained without injury (4). In the promises met with in the histories of the patriarchs, the זֶרַע of Abraham (xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18), Isaac (xxvi. 4), and Jacob (xxviii. 14), in whom all the nations of the earth are to bless themselves (comp. § 23, with note 5), is not, as many expositors insist, merely an individual, the expression referring to the entire race of Abraham as the recipients of revelation, though these promises have their final fulfilment in Christ (5). On the other hand, many moderns (so Hengstenberg) regard Shiloh in ch. lxix. 10 as a personal proper name, viz. as the designation of the Prince of Peace who is to proceed from Judah,—"Till Shiloh come, and to Him is the obedience of the people,"—a view which, though certainly opposed by the *Parallelismus membrorum*, is still possible, and in any case preferable to that which regards שִׁילֹה as that town in the tribe of Ephraim which was in the time of the judges (§ 158) the central point of the theocracy (even Delitzsch rendering "till he come to Shiloh"). The passage is, however, probably to be explained by taking שִׁילֹה appellatively of the rest into which Judah shall enter after victorious conflict: "until he comes to the place of rest, and the people obey him" (6). The passage is chiefly important as showing that the government of the kingdom of God is to devolve upon the tribe of Judah. The saying of Balaam, Num. xxiv. 17 sqq. (comp. § 30, with note 4), already interpreted in a Messianic sense by Jewish antiquity (Onkelos), points to an illustrious sway proceeding from Israel, which is to subdue the neighbouring states, and to outlast the fall of the nations far and near,—a sway which certainly cannot be conceived of apart from a personal ruler. Finally, with respect to the promise, Deut. xviii. 15–19 (already fully discussed, § 161, comp. § 97), which is still interpreted by many in a directly Messianic sense, נָבִיא cannot, according to the context, be confined to a single individual, the passage referring rather to the institution of the prophetic order. It is not, however,

Digitized by Google

without significance for the development of the Messianic idea, for it teaches that for the realization of the theocratic purposes there is needed not merely a ruler to conquer the hostile world, but also a mediator through whom Jehovah may speak, and who may declare His counsel in words. According to this principle, the kingdom of God cannot attain its consummation unless this ruler is also a prophet.

(1) See my article *Messias* in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* ix. p. 408 sqq.

(2) That prophecy, moreover, views the relation of this second David to Jehovah as an internal one, will be shown below (§ 231).

(3) On the use of the word in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, and in the New Testament, see the article cited, p. 409.

(4) On Gen. iv. 1, see § 69. 2, with note 5; on v. 29, § 20, with note 6.

(5) Hence the passages quoted are, in their more extended signification, Messianic.

(6) It is quite incorrect to refer עַמִּים to the tribes of Israel.

§ 230.

The promise, 2 Sam. vii., as the Foundation of the Messianic Idea in its stricter sense. The Messianic Psalms.

The choice of the house of David, already spoken of in another connection (comp. 2 Sam. vii. with 1 Chron. xvii.), forms the foundation of the Messianic idea in its stricter sense. David desires to build a house for the Lord, who forbids the undertaking, but promises, on the other hand, that He will build David a house, by establishing his seed in the kingdom for ever. To this seed of David will God be a father, and this seed shall be the Son of God. God will punish the sins of David's seed in measure, but not with extirpation; on the contrary, He will never wholly take His favour from him. *The*

Digitized by Google

Seed of David to whom this promise applies is not the whole of David's descendants: He is indeed to be *of David's sons*, as 1 Chron. xvii. 11 adds by way of explanation, but He is not limited to a single individual. According to the exposition which the Old Testament itself gives of this promise, the seed means the descendants of David so far as by Divine favour they are elected to the succession to the throne; and the passage does not speak of the eternal sway of one king, but of the continual kingship of the house of David, David himself designating the word as spoken concerning his *house* for ever, 2 Sam. vii. 25. The fulfilment of the promise began, according to 1 Chron. xxii. 9 sq., 1 Kings v. 19, with Solomon, but is referred by the psalms which comment upon it, Ps. lxxxix. 30 sqq., and also cxxxii. 11 sq., to all the descendants of David who succeed to the throne. 2 Sam. vii., however, forms in a twofold respect the starting-point for the more definite form of the Messianic idea,—*first*, by the fact that that consummation of the kingdom of God for which Israel was chosen, is from this time forward connected with a King who, as the Son of God, *i.e.* the representative of Jehovah, and, fitted by Him to be the depositary of the Divine sovereignty on earth, stands in a relation of most intimate connection with God (1); and, *secondly*, in that it is established for all time that this King is to be a Son of David. (That "for ever" must be taken in its strict sense, is shown by Ps. lxxxix. 37 sq.) The seed of David may be humbled, but not for ever, 1 Kings xi. 39 (2). The crown of David may be taken away, but One will come whose right it is, Ezek. xxi. 31 sq. The topmost branch of the cedar, which in Ezekiel's vision, ch. xvii., represents the house of David, may be broken off (3), but the cedar itself remains. How glorious the view of the Davidic kingdom is rendered by the promise, 2 Sam. vii., is first shown by the last song of David, 2 Sam. xxiii. Its delineation of a righteous ruler, under whom a happy future is to flourish, and its statement that such a government signifies the eternal covenant made by God with the house

Digitized by Google

of David, plainly shows that the perception of the *idea* of the kingship is here already advancing towards its individualization in an *ideal*, and thus arises *figurative prophecy*, as Sack aptly calls it. Qualities which apply not to himself personally, but to the kingship which he represents, may indeed be attributed to every king who sits on David's throne; and this is the principle by which such passages as Ps. xxi. 5, 7, lxi. 7, are to be explained. But sacred poetry, under the impulse of the Spirit, now creates a kingly image, in which all that the present manifests is far surpassed, and the kingship of David and Solomon beheld in typical perfection. This leads us to the *Messianic psalms*, ii., xlv., lxxii., cx., with respect to which *three different views* have at all times existed. According to *the first* (which is in part already found in Calvin), these psalms are to be referred to some actual Israelite king; but since they idealize his government, and thus transfer to him predicates, such as the right to universal sovereignty, Ps. ii. 2, and the union of an everlasting priesthood with his kingship, Ps. cx., which cannot find in him their full historical accomplishment, they typically point to the future realizer of the theocratic kingship. According to *the second* view (Hengstenberg, Umbreit), the poet, filled with the idea of the theocratic kingship, really rises in these psalms to the view of an individual in whom this idea is perfectly realized, and hence, according to the mind of the Spirit, is speaking of the coming Messiah. According to *the third* view (4), we must in these psalms distinguish between their original signification, by which they refer to an historical king, and the use which, as prophetic and Messianic songs of praise, they subsequently acquired in Divine worship. This third view is especially applicable to Ps. xlv., which was originally composed on the occasion of the marriage of an Israelite king, perhaps Solomon, with the daughter of the Egyptian king, but which certainly acquired, by allegorical interpretation, a Messianic signification in its liturgical use by the church and in older Jewish theology (5), so far as we can trace it back. The second view—

Digitized by Google

the directly Messianic interpretation—is, on the other hand, fully borne out, even apart from any subsequent use of these songs, in the three remaining psalms,—in Ps. ii., which describes the victorious Prince as receiving, in virtue of His Divine Sonship, the whole earth as His inheritance (6); in Ps. lxxii., which prays for the coming of the great Prince of Peace, who shall reign with righteousness for ever, shall especially defend the poor and afflicted, and to whom, therefore, all the nations and kings of the earth shall do homage, and in whom, ver. 17, the words spoken of Abraham's seed, Gen. xxii. 18, etc., shall find their fulfilment; and in Ps. cx., which celebrates the King who subdues the hostile world as being at the same time the possessor of an everlasting priesthood (7). The so-called historical interpretation would here evacuate the meaning of some passages, and have to be supported by hyperbole, etc.

(1) See further particulars in § 165, note 7.

(2) The continued right of the race of David to the throne is never called in question by prophecy, though it often passes sentence of rejection upon individual kings of Judah.

(3) Ezek. xvii.: An eagle comes and breaks off the topmost branch of the cedar and brings it into a land of traffic, a city of merchants; *i.e.*, according to the prophet's own explanation, Nebuchadnezzar comes and carries away King Jehoiachin with the rest of the royal family to Babylon. The eagle, on the other hand, plants a twig of vine in the land, signifying the appointment of Zedekiah by Nebuchadnezzar. But this plant is also rooted up.

(4) So H. Schultz on the double meaning of Scripture, in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1866, No. 1, and *Alttest. Theol.* ii. p. 336 sq.

(5) In Ps. xlv. the Messianic view is generally combined with the allegorical interpretation. It is only by doing some violence to the language that the allegorical meaning can be regarded as originally intended by the author, especially if the psalm is held to be an allegorical representation of the union of Messiah

Digitized by Google

with Israel (the שִׁגָּל), whom the heathen nations (the virgins, the companions of the queen) follow. How greatly, to bring forward only one point, is the notion found in ver. 11, that Israel, to unite with the Messiah, must forget its people and father's house, opposed to the entire Old Testament view! When the Targum explains the passage by Josh. xxiv. 14,—when Hengstenberg refers to Gen. xii. 1, and v. Gerlach dilutes the thought to, Israel must make no kind of claim on the ground of its previous relations,—these are the mere expedients of perplexity, and do justice neither to the words nor the context. The bride is evidently the daughter of a *heathen* king; and hence, if the psalm is allegorically interpreted, the explanation of H. A. Hahn (*Das Hohelied von Salomo übersetzt und erklärt*, p. 5), which makes it merely describe the introduction of the heathen world into the kingdom of God, is a more obvious one.

(6) When it is thought to set aside this view by the remark that it is inconceivable that the author should intend to sing the praise of a king who is only expected, there is a strange disregard of the fact that in Ps. lxxxvii., *e.g.*, the future glories of the city of God, and in Ps. xcvi.–xcviii., of the future coming of Jehovah to establish His kingdom, are thus extolled in song. Why should not the minstrel be equally able to behold and treat as present the future rule of Messiah? Would it not have been strange indeed if the Messianic hopes of Israel had found no expression in the sacred poetry of the Old Testament?

(7) In Ps. cx., the feature that an everlasting priesthood is awarded to this King, ver. 4, is of special significance. The theocratic kingship had indeed already attained in David a certain priestly character (see § 165, with note 8); but such a union of the priesthood with the kingship as existed in the person of Melchizedek is, from the standpoint of the theocratic institutions, impossible. The expression "after the manner of Melchizedek" leads beyond these; and it is because this union of priesthood and kingship was a thing so utterly unheard of, so entirely new, that a Divine oath was needed to introduce its announcement. The union of the priestly and kingly offices in Messiah here proclaimed will be more particularly considered, § 234.

Digitized by Google

§ 231.

The Development of the Idea of Messiah in the Prophets: the older Prophetic Writings; the Prophetic Doctrine concerning the Nature of Messiah.

If we now turn to the *prophetic books*, we shall find in the *older writings* none of the more special references to the person of the Messiah. In the description of the times of redemption in Amos ix. 11 (§ 227), the restoration of the fallen kingship of David is only spoken of in a general manner. In Hos. iii. 5, comp. with ii. 2, there is a more distinct mention of the reunion of all Israel, at their restoration, under one head of the family of David. But full and detailed predictions of the Messiah are not met with till after the middle of the eighth century, in Isaiah and Micah, whose aim it was to explain, in the light of the Divine counsels, the approaching catastrophes in which Israel would be involved by its complication with the secular powers, and to show that the final aim of the ways of God was being prepared for by the impending judgments. Such Messianic prophecy is, however, by no means introduced by them as something absolutely new and till now alien to prophetic consciousness (1). The low estate to which the Davidic kingdom had fallen was indeed the external occasion of directing the prophetic glance the more vividly towards its perfection, because it is at those times when the Divine promise seems, humanly speaking, to fail, that it is the office of prophecy to testify to its indestructible validity; but it is by no means true that the contemplation of the contrast begot the image of the Messiah (2). To sum up, then, the essential features of Messianic prophecy, let us inquire, *first*, What does prophecy teach concerning the *nature* of Messiah? does it attribute to Him a superhuman dignity? The meaning of almost all the passages on this subject has been made a matter of controversy. We begin with Mic. v. 2 sqq. (3). Accord-

Digitized by Google

ing to ver. 2, Messiah is indeed to proceed from Bethlehem, the small and insignificant town of David; but "His goings forth" (מוֹצָאֹתָיו) are "from of old, from the days of eternity." If the latter words, expressing as they do a contrast with the origin from Bethlehem, refer, as many moderns assert, merely to the descent of Messiah from the ancient house of David, the contrast they present is indeed a very faint one, in which, moreover, the evident reference of מוֹצָאֹתָיו to לִי יֵצֵא in the preceding clause (see especially Umbreit on the passage) is not done justice to. The words speak either of an eternal and Divine origin of Messiah (4), or state—in which case certainly there is more reason for the use of the plural מוֹצָאוֹת—that the entire sacred history from its very beginnings (*origines*) contains the going forths of Messiah, the preparatory elements of His coming (5). In ver. 3, Micah says mysteriously of the birth of Messiah, "Therefore will He give them up" (Israel to judgment) "until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth." To understand (with Calvin and many moderns, even Kleinert) יוֹלֵדָה, by referring back to iv. 9 sq., of the daughter of Zion, is forbidden even by the absence of the article. The passage speaks of the mother of the Messiah; and the prophet, as Hitzig correctly remarks, "expresses himself with becoming reserve concerning obscure and mysterious subjects." It may readily be perceived that the prophets, however near at hand their intuition may make the advent of Messiah, never speak of Him as the son of any actually existing king (6). Isa. iv. 2, if Messiah is there spoken of, as the Targumists already supposed, corresponds with Mic. v. 2, the coming One being then designated the צֶמַח יְהוָה by His Divine, and the פְּרִי הָאָרֶץ by His earthly and national descent. This interpretation is, however, by no means certain. The passage Mic. v. 3, on the other hand, is parallel with the prophecy Isa. vii. 14 of the birth of Immanuel from the עַלְמָה, a passage whose reference to the Messiah is demanded by its connection with ix. 5 (7), though the interpretation at present prevailing

Digitized by Google

regards it as only typically Messianic (see even Bengel's Gnomon). עַלְמָה, indeed, is not = בְּתוּלָה, as if the birth of Messiah from the *virgo illibata* were here taught. Besides, the essential feature of the given sign is not the fact that a עַלְמָה conceives, but that the Messiah is Immanuel, that the unchangeable communion of God with His people is actually made apparent in the midst of impending judgments. The mysterious nature, however, of the expression can neither here nor in Micah be mistaken (8). The exalted nature of the Messiah is more definitely brought forward in ix. 6 sq.: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government is upon His shoulders; and His name is called the Wonderful, Counsellor (9), the mighty God" (for so must it be understood, comp. x. 21), "the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace; for the increase of the government and peace without end, on David's throne and in his kingdom, to establish and support it with judgment and justice, from henceforth and for ever." The Messiah is evidently regarded as a Divine Being, though here also the expressions are mysteriously indefinite. In the Messianic passage xi. 1 sqq., the Divine element in the Messiah appears only as the fulness of the Spirit of the Lord resting upon Him, and endowing Him for His righteous and happy rule. How close, side by side, to use Stier's expression, the two lines of promise—the appearance of God and the appearance of Messiah—run, and seem almost to touch without uniting, is shown also by the Messianic predictions of the subsequent prophets. And first, we must notice Jer. xxiii. in connection with xxxiii. 14–26 and Ezek. xxxiv. In the first passage, the prophet, who in ch. xxii. had declared the race of the two kings Jehoiachin and Jehoiakim to be excluded from the throne of David, proclaims that the Lord will, at the time when He gathers His flock from all countries whither He has driven them, raise up unto David a righteous Branch (צֶמַח) (10). The same expression reappears xxxiii. 15; nay, Zemach becomes even a proper name of the Messiah,

Digitized by Google

Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12. (From these passages, it is very evident that when in Jer. xxx. 9, Ezek. xxxiv. 23 sq., xxxviii. 24, it is said with reference to the future ruler, that David is to be raised up, we are not, like Ammon (11) and others, to imagine a resurrection of the former king David.) When, then, it is said, Jer. xxiii. 6, of the Messiah, that the name wherewith He shall be called is "the Lord our righteousness" (יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ), older theology was certainly mistaken in regarding this as a proof text of the first order for the divinity of the Messiah; for it is not said that Messiah is Jehovah our righteousness, but that He is called Jehovah our righteousness, because in Him and through Him Jehovah is perceived to constitute His people's righteousness. In the parallel passage, xxxiii. 16, moreover, it is said that in those days *Jerusalem* shall be called Jehovah our righteousness, and in Ex. xvii. 15 an altar is called "Jehovah my banner." When, however, the Messiah is designated, Jer. xxx. 21, as the Governor that shall proceed from the midst of the people, whom God will cause to draw near to Him that He may approach unto Him,—"for who is this that engages His heart to approach unto me?"—a specific relation of the Messiah to Jehovah such as no human being could claim for himself is here alluded to by Jeremiah also. With this corresponds the גֶּבֶר עֲמִיתִי, "the man that is my fellow," of Zech. xiii. 7, according to the only tenable and Messianic interpretation of this passage. Special stress has been laid upon xii. 8. It is there declared how the Lord will, in the last conflict that shall rage against the Holy City, defend and strengthen the citizens, so that in that day "he that stumbles among them shall be as David, and the house of David as God, as the angel of the Lord before them." Here, it has been said, the house of David is comprised in its head, the Messiah, who is here designated as the angel in whom Jehovah, in the days of old, marched at the head of His people. But does such a view of "the house of David" agree with the connection with ver. 7,

Digitized by Google

and especially with ver. 10 sqq.? If lamentation for the pierced Messiah (of which we shall speak § 234) is really the subject of ver. 10, must not the house of David in ver. 8 be taken in the same sense as the מִשְׁפַּחַת בֵּית־דָּוִיד of ver. 12, *i.e.* exclusive of the Messiah? (12). But then we ask, If the house of David is in those days endowed with such conquering power as to be compared even to the angel of the Lord, what will the second David Himself be? The second passage on this topic, Mal. iii. 1, is also a subject of controversy: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare thy way before thee, and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple, and the angel (messenger) of the covenant whom ye desire, behold, He shall come;" ver. 2: "But who may abide the day of His coming, and who shall stand when He appeareth?" It is evident from iv. 23 sq. (13) who the preceding messenger is,—a prophet zealous for the law is, in the power of Elias, to call the people to repentance, that the day of the Lord's appearing may not be for their destruction. But the Lord who sends this harbinger before Him, and then Himself comes to His temple, is Jehovah (14), the God of judgment,—longed for, according to ii. 17, by the people, as appears also by comparing iii. 5. But who then is the מַלְאַךְ הַבְּרִית, the angel of the covenant, whose coming coincides with the coming of Jehovah? Certainly not the forerunner spoken of at the beginning of the verse. We naturally think of that angel of the Divine presence by whom Jehovah once led His people in the wilderness, and who was now again to be the instrument of His covenant relation to Israel (15); but in this case this passage says nothing of the coming of Messiah (16). It is, however, also admissible to refer, with Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, i. 1st ed. p. 162, 2d ed. p. 183), the מַלְאַךְ הַבְּרִית as well as the first מַלְאָךְ to a human instrument for the establishment of the covenant, the counterpart of Moses, the Mediator of the new and more perfect relation and communion between God and His people, and therefore to the Messiah Himself. Then indeed

Digitized by Google

the passage does identify the coming of Jehovah with the coming of Messiah, but without stating anything concerning the internal relation of the two to each other. Finally, we turn to the teaching of the Book of Daniel. In the chief passage, vii. 13 sq. (17), whose interpretation is also controverted, Daniel sees in a vision one like a son of man, coming with the clouds of heaven, brought before the Ancient of Days, and endowed by Him with eternal dominion over all nations. The view (Hofmann and Köhler) that the human form here spoken of signifies not an individual, the Messiah, but the Messianic kingdom, the possessors of which are the saints of the Most High, vers. 18, 22, 27 (§ 227, note 1),—that this kingdom is, in contrast to those secular kingdoms denoted by symbolical forms of animals coming from beneath, a heavenly and a genuinely human one,—cannot be decidedly refuted. As far, however, as traditional exegesis can be followed back (18), the son of man has been regarded as the Messiah, who hence appears, as St. Paul says, as the Lord from heaven (19). Besides, the secular powers also appear incorporated in individual rulers (as the Chaldean in Nebuchadnezzar, ii. 38). It has been already remarked (§ 199) (20), that if the Messianic interpretation of the passage is adopted, the combination of the son of man with the mysterious being in viii. 15–17, x. 5 sqq., xii. 6 sqq., is an obvious step (21).

(1) The view which makes Messianic hopes in general originate in the 8th century B.C. cannot be made good.

(2) Neither is it the case, as Delitzsch says (*Luth. Zeitschr.* 1850, i. p. 34), that in Isaiah and Micah the view of the person of Messiah occupies the foreground only in the times of Ahaz, and, on the other hand, retreats in that of Hezekiah, because, as Hezekiah walked in the steps of his ancestor David, there was no motive for contrasting with his reign that of the future righteous Son of David. For, not to mention that the compilation at least of the Book of Micah undoubtedly took place in the time of Hezekiah (§ 181, note 3), the discourse of

Digitized by Google

which Isa. xi. sq. forms the close was delivered in his reign, to which the only natural way of understanding x. 11 refers; while the Messianic interpretation must be considered the more probable one in most of those passages which have been referred to Hezekiah, *e.g.* xxxii. 1, xxxiii. 17.

(3) The prophet here contrasts the siege of Zion and the disgraceful treatment of the judge (king) of Israel, predicted v. 1, with the appearance of the Messiah.

(4) So Caspari. Micah, however, makes no further disclosure in this respect.

(5) So Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1, 1st ed. p. 9, 2d ed. p. 9 sq.): "The ruler has been going forth from inconceivably distant ages, and His advent is approaching; and this advent is at length to proceed from Bethlehem. For since He is the person to whom the history of mankind, of Israel, and of the house of David tends, all the progress of any of these are but germs of His advent, goings forth of the second son of Jesse, of the second David."

(6) According to Mic. v. 4, the Messiah shall then "stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, and in the majesty of the name of the Lord His God;" hence He is to be endowed with Divine power, that He may conduct His government with Divine authority, and be the revealer of Jehovah. The expression recalls the former angel of the covenant, Ex. xxiii. 21.

(7) Ewald especially has again defended the Messianic interpretation of Isa. vii. 14.

(8) I cannot here enter into all the other difficulties.

(9) Compare in elucidation Isa. xxviii. 29, and Judg. xiii. 18.

(10) עַמִּי must not be collectively understood, as by Graf.

(11) See Ammon, *Die Fortbildung des Christenthums zur Weltreligion*, i. p. 178; also Hitzig. Compare the expectation of King Sebastian by the Portuguese, and of Barbarossa by the Germans.

(12) So Schmieder, whose further exposition of the passage may be omitted.

(13) Mal. iv. 5: "Behold, I will send unto you Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord."

(14) Not the Messiah; so Jahn, *Appendix herm.* i. p. 58.

Digitized by Google

(15) So *e.g.* Hävernick, *Theol. des A. T.* 1st ed. p. 174, 2d ed. p. 212.

(16) Though it is in fact quite correct "that this announcement received its final fulfilment in the appearance of Christ, in whom the angel of the Lord, the λόγος, became flesh" (Hengstenberg *in loc.*).

(17) Dan. vii. 13 sq. forms the conclusion of the prophetic vision, in which the four universal empires are represented under the image of four beasts (§ 221). After the dominion is taken from these beasts, the kingdom of God is set up. "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like a son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before Him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

(18) The oldest witnesses of this are the *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* of the New Testament and the Book of Enoch.

(19) At the same time he appears as man. As C. B. Michaelis justly remarks, there is no more a Docetic element in כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ than in *ὅμοιος υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου*, Rev. i. 13: כְּ *non excludit rei veritatem, sed formam ejus, quod visum est, describit.* (Hengstenberg thinks otherwise, and considers the expression to point to the fact that there is in the Messiah another aspect in which He is far more than human.)

(20) According to the usual view, the Messiah does not again appear among the celestial beings of the Book of Daniel.

(21) The identification of this *κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* in human form, who even during the time of the secular empires advances the counsel of God in the heathen world, and at last receives universal dominion, with the son of David of the other prophets, is not indeed completed in the Book of Daniel. Such a circumstance is, however, characteristic of prophecy; see § 216. 3. For while we find in the Old Testament the postulates of all the essential definitions of New Testament Christology, the revelation which organically combines and completes them is not given till the facts of revelation are consummated.

Digitized by Google

§ 232.

Continuation: The Office and Work of the Messiah.

With respect, *secondly*, to the *office* and *work* of the Messiah, these are, as the name itself implies, first those of a *king*. His coming presupposes the rejection of the nation, and the deepest humiliation of the house of David; hence the Messianic kingdom rises from an abject to a glorious state. This thought is already implied in Mic. v. 2, but especially in Isa. xi. 1. The Messiah comes forth as a rod out of the גֵּזַע (the trunk of a hewn-down tree, as in Job xiv. 8) of Jesse (1). The passage Ezek. xvii. 22 sqq., already cited § 230, also treats of this subject. From the lofty cedar of Lebanon, the Lord takes a tender twig and plants it on Mount Zion; this twig grows into a goodly cedar, under whose shadow all the birds of the air (the different nations of the earth) assemble, and which is exalted above all the trees of the field (the earthly powers) (2). With this corresponds the description Zech. ix. 9 sq. It is not with the pomp of an earthly conqueror, but with lowly array and riding upon an ass, that the Messiah makes His entry into Jerusalem. His kingdom has no need of warlike weapons, which are, on the contrary, to be abolished (comp. Isa. ix. 4). Beginning at Jerusalem, He founds a peaceful kingdom, which is to reach from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth (3). When, then, the Messianic government is here, as also in Mic. v. 6 sqq., and afterwards in Zech. ix. 11 sqq., again represented as a warlike one, the remarks already made (§ 216. 3) on such unconnected juxtaposition of dissimilar features must be applied.

The question, however, which even in the ancient church was one of the most important subjects of dispute, especially in meeting the objections of the Jews, viz. Does the Old Testament also speak of a *suffering* Christ? (*Χριστὸς παθητός*), *i.e.*

Digitized by Google

one who atones by death and suffering for the sins of the people, now claims a more particular discussion. The Messianic passages hitherto quoted do not involve this. The incipient abasement of the Messiah, considered in and by itself, stands in no relation to the abolition of sin. According to Isa. xi. 4, 9, the Messiah effects the latter, first, by judging righteously, by smiting the land with the rod of His mouth, and slaying the wicked with the breath of His lips; and, secondly, by the fact that under Him the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, so that none shall hurt or destroy upon His holy mountain. But, together with these statements, there is another prophetic view which points to a servant of God who suffers in the place of the people, to an act of atonement on which the dawning of the day of redemption depends, to the priesthood of the Messiah. To make evident, however, the connection between this branch of prophecy and the whole doctrinal system of the Old Testament, it will be necessary to enter somewhat more into detail.

(1) The royal race is named after Jesse, because the appearance of the Messiah, the second David, corresponds with the elevation of the first David from his low estate, on which account also Messiah, like the first David, proceeds from the insignificant town of Bethlehem.

(2) This must certainly not be explained of Zerubbabel, but of the Messianic kingship, which was to be raised from small and improbable beginnings to glory.

(3) For further particulars on the progress of the Messianic kingdom, see § 228.

§ 233.

Continuation.

The answer given by the Old Testament to the question, *Of what importance are the sufferings of the righteous with respect to the kingdom of God?* is, in the first place, that inasmuch as

Digitized by Google

the sufferings of a righteous man give occasion to the manifestation of God's faithfulness and power in his deliverance, they serve not only as a pattern and pledge of the grace of God to strengthen and comfort other just men, but also to procure an acknowledgment of His saving power from those who as yet have not known Him. This thought is most completely carried out in the 22d Psalm. A guiltless sufferer, exposed to ruthless enemies and undergoing agonizing torture, prays for deliverance from his misery. While he is wrestling in prayer, faith triumphs; nay, in the latter part of the psalm, prayer is exchanged for the glad announcement that it has been heard. Then follows a description how, in consequence of this Divine act of deliverance, all who are afflicted and exposed to death find refreshment at the sacrificial feast made by the rescued sufferer; nay, the ends of the earth, all the heathen nations, turn to the Lord. This description at the end of the psalm recalls especially the predicted feast of the Messianic days, Isa. xxv. 6 sqq., which God is preparing upon Mount Zion for all nations, and at which the mourning veil shall be taken from all nations, and death for ever destroyed (§ 226) (1). Whether the psalm expresses the experience of a David (2), a Jeremiah, or some other servant of God, the description given of the causal connection between the sufferings of a righteous man and the consummation of the kingdom of God far surpasses anything that could be predicated of any Old Testament character. Neither can Israel as a nation (so Kimchi), well as many of the expressions apply, be the subject of the psalm; for the speaker very decidedly distinguishes himself from the people, ver. 23 sq. The fact is (comp. Hengstenberg's later explanation of the psalm), that we have here portrayed an ideal individual, in whom the sufferings of the servant of God and their happy results are complete. It cannot indeed be proved that the Messiah, the Son of David, is in the Psalmist's intention the subject of the psalm, though the thought that the path from suffering to glory which David had to tread would be repeated

Digitized by Google

in the case also of his great descendant, could not be very distant. A far more profound view is, however, taken of the sufferings of a just man, when the light in which they are regarded is that of *substitutionary atonement*. That the intercession of the righteous for a sinful nation is effectual, is a thought running through the entire Old Testament from Gen. xviii. 23 sqq. and Ex. xxxii. 32 sqq. (comp. Ps. cvi. 23, and subsequently Amos vii. 1 sqq.) onwards. This subject has already been repeatedly brought forward (see § 29, with note 3, § 127). It is indeed also stated that guilt may reach a height at which God will no longer accept the intercession of His servants, Jer. xv. 1 sq. (3). There is a limit to the prophet's duty of standing in the breach, as it is expressed Ezek. xiii. 5 and elsewhere. Jeremiah is commanded to intercede no more for the people, now ripe for judgment. And indeed even the righteousness of the servants of God is insufficient in His sight to constitute them valid intercessors for the sinful people. Their appointed mediators (מְלִיצִים) are themselves sinful, and therefore incapable of averting the decree of judgment from the nation; see as chief passage, Isa. xliii. 27. They must be contented if they deliver themselves by their righteousness, Ezek. xiv. 14 sqq. But for this very reason the prophecy of redemption is not complete till it beholds an individual who is capable of effectually advocating the cause of the people before God; and this is the servant of the Lord, Isa. liii. That the prophetic intuition of the עֶבֶד יְהוָה in the Book of Isaiah, xl.–lxvi., commences with the nation, but culminates in an individual, has been already remarked in § 227. So early as ch. xlii. and xlix. the view is gradually transferred from the nation to an individual distinct from the nation, who (xlii. 6) negotiates a covenant for the people, and then becomes the light of the Gentiles—who, as mediator of the covenant, resettles the people like a second Joshua in the possession of the land, xlix. 8 (4). Even if these passages are got over, by referring the servant, so far as he is distinguished from the

Digitized by Google

people, to that germ which represents the genuine Israel, the aggregate of the servants of God, including the true prophets (5), ch. liii., on the contrary, can only refer to an individual. Hence Ewald, *e.g.*, regards this portion as interpolated from an older book, in which a single martyr was spoken of. For it is not the heathen who speak, as the utterly erroneous view now so widely disseminated asserts, but the prophet, now in the name of the prophets in general, ver. 1: "Who hath believed our report?" and now in that of the people, ver. 6: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of *us* all." The sense of guilt is so vivid, even in the case of the prophets who know themselves to be the servants of God, that they include themselves in the sinful mass of the people for whom an atonement is needed: "*We* are *all* as the unclean" (comp. lix. 12). Hence a valid intercession for the people cannot proceed from them, lix. 16; nor can even the aggregate of God's servants effect an atonement. On the contrary, it is upon the foundation of its intuition of those witnesses who have suffered in the cause of truth, that prophecy rises to the intuition of one in whom the image of the faithful servant is complete,—of one who, not for his own sins, but as the substitute of the people and for their sins, lays down his life as an אָשָׁם (liii. 10, comp. § 137), a payment in full for debt, but is, notwithstanding the prophetic message (שִׁמְעָתֵנוּ, ver. 1) which points to him, despised and regarded by his people, for whom he appears, as stricken of God for his own transgressions (6); nay, who is, moreover, treated even in death like the violent wicked and the deceitful rich (עָשִׁיר in ver. 9, 1*b*, being elucidated by the contrast in 2*b*), and like those whom a curse follows even to the grave. God leads him from the grave to glory, so that he is now the author of righteousness to many, and divides the spoil with the strong. The supposed traces of a collective meaning in לָמוֹ, ver. 8, and בְּמֹתָיו, ver. 9, disappear when they are correctly interpreted (7). Thus it was during

Digitized by Google

the period when Israel was without a place of sacrifice in which to seek for an atonement by the blood of beasts, that it was disclosed to the prophetic spirit that the voluntary self-sacrifice of one perfectly righteous would be an atoning sacrifice for the redemption of the people.

(1) This sacrificial feast, Ps. xxii. 27, at which those exposed to death eat of such things that their hearts live for ever, reaches far beyond what an Israelite was accustomed, according to Deut. xvi. 11, to prepare for the poor and needy.

(2) A corresponding situation in David's life cannot be pointed out; even 1 Sam. xxiii. 25, to which Hofmann refers, does not entirely answer.

(3) Jer. xv. 1: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people: cast them out of my sight, and let them go forth."

(4) In Isa. xlii. 1, the servant upon whom the Spirit of the Lord rests, that he may bring forth the claims of the Lord before the Gentiles, forms, in the first place, a contrast to heathendom and its *windy* ways, xli. 29. As the discourse proceeds, however, he is, ver. 7, placed beside Cyrus, which speaks for the concentration of the עֶבֶד in an individual. Comp. Delitzsch in Drechsler's Commentary on Isa. iii. p. 336 sq.: "The notion עֶבֶד יְהוָה is, to represent it briefly, palpably, a pyramid; its lowest base is collective Israel, its middle part Israel not *κατὰ σάρκα* but *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, its apex the person of the Redeemer. It is one and the same notion which, when concentrated, becomes personal, and when extended is again national." What has been said above may show how far I now think it necessary to modify what I formerly said in my article on the Servant of Jehovah, Isa. xl. sqq. (*Tübinger Zeitschrift*, 1840, No. 2, p. 134 sqq.).

(5) That the true prophets are included among these servants of God, is self-evident; nay, Isa. xlviii. 16, l. 4 sqq., may be so far referred to the prophet himself. It would be from his own experience of sorrow that he here depicted the servant of the Lord. But it is utterly incorrect to suppose that the prophetic order is directly intended by this image. For how could it be the office of the prophetic order to distribute to the restored people their desolated inheritance, etc., not to mention that the prophets

Digitized by Google

formed no corporate body, nay, that in lvi. 10 the mass of the עַמִּים are designated as blind and ignorant, and as dumb dogs?

(6) Isa. liii. 4 sq.: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, yet did we esteem him stricken of God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed."

(7) In illustration of the latter, comp. Ezek. xxviii. 8. Delitzsch, in his excellent article, *Die Stellung der Weissagung Isa.* lii. *im Zusammenhang der alttest. Heilsverkündigung*, in the *Zeitschrift für luth. Theol.* 1850, i. p. 35, thus understands the passage: "The church, even if put to death in many of its members, would still be immortal, nay, by the very fact of dying for the Lord's sake, would prove herself to live. This abased church, these dispersed of the Lord, through whose faithful testimony even unto death the work of the Lord prospers, etc., is the עֶבֶד יְהוָה." But this view is demolished by the only natural explanation of כְּלָנוּ, Isa. liii. 6.

§ 234.

Continuation.

What has been said, however, still leaves it an open question whether the prophet was himself conscious that *this servant of God, who atones by his sufferings for the sins of the people, is indeed the Messiah, i.e.* the great Son of David. A decided answer to this question cannot be given either in the affirmative or negative (1). In the Book Isaiah, xl. sqq., there is but one passage (lv. 3 sqq.) in which the promise to David is returned to. The statement there made, that David is appointed to be a witness and a commander of the people, may be combined with liii. 12, according to which the servant, after having completed his work of atonement, divides the spoil with the strong (2). But the connection of the two views is certainly not fully effected. On the other side, however, it is not true that the prophet divides (as Ewald says) the secular and spiritual sides of the notion of Messiah between Cyrus and the servant of

Digitized by Google

the Lord. For though Cyrus appears indeed as a Divine instrument for the deliverance of Israel, and gives glory, as a heathen, to the name of Jehovah, he is not brought forward as one who is to carry on unto perfection the kingdom of God upon earth. In Zechariah, on the contrary, the Messiah distinctly appears as the future Redeemer of the people, and indeed as their atoning High Priest. This is the case first in ch. iii. (comp. § 200), where the people are comforted by the statement that God will graciously accept the priesthood over which he presides, while in ver. 8 sq. it is further declared that the true time of grace is still future. The perfect High Priest to whom the present priesthood typically refers is *the Branch*, the Son of David (comp. § 231). Hence allusion is now made, vi. 9–15, by the symbolical action of crowning the high priest Joshua with the double crown, to the union of the priestly and royal dignities in the person of Messiah. For in this so often incorrectly understood passage the Branch can alone be the subject of וְהָיָה, ver. 13, and two persons are not there spoken of.

The Messiah here appears as an atoning Priest; but another special feature is added, xii. 10–13. The prophet declares that the future restoration of the communion of the covenant people with the Lord will be effected on His part by the outpouring of the spirit of grace and supplication, and on that of the people by contrition and repentance: "I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born. In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddo." Thus much is clear in this much-misused passage, that the piercing of one, in whose person the Lord is as it were Himself pierced, is spoken of. The assassination of a prophet, as Hitzig supposes, is very

Digitized by Google

far from being intended. The pierced one must be one who may be likened to King Josiah, with whom, when he was mortally wounded in the valley of Megiddo, the last hope of the nation fell (§ 184). And who else can this be than that Shepherd and fellow of Jehovah, who, according to xiii. 7, fell by the sword, after the last effort of deliverance which God made through him had proved vain, nay, had been shamefully requited, xi. 4–14. Justice was so far done to the Messianic interpretation by older Jewish theology, that since the acknowledgment of a suffering and dying son of David could not from its standpoint be conceded, it invented for this passage a second Messiah, "the Messiah, the son of Joseph," who was to fall in the conflict with Gog and Magog. Lastly, with respect to the passage Dan. ix. 24 sqq., the מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד, who suffers the death which involves Jerusalem in destruction, is indeed understood by one set of interpreters of the Messiah (3). This is, however, opposed by the reference of the whole passage to the Maccabean period, as the connection certainly requires. The מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד who perishes is then regarded as the assassinated high priest Onias III., in which case, however, the passage would still have a typical reference to the Messiah (4).

(1) It cannot be disputed that the point of view which generally occupies the foreground in the description of the servant is not the consummation of the kingdom, but the fulfilment of Israel's national vocation. So also, in the description of the church's future glory, Isa. lx. sq., the kingdom is no longer mentioned.

(2) Isa. lv. 3 sqq. is now mostly explained so as to make it transfer the office of the race of David to the people. But it is also possible that he in whom David is to be a witness, leader, and commander to the people is the Messiah.

(3) See Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, 2d ed. iii. 1, p. 64 sqq.

(4) On the Messianic doctrine of extra-canonical Judaism, see the article quoted, 422 sq. On the history of Messianic interpretation in the Christian church, comp. the treatise of Hengstenberg, *id.* iii. 2, p. 121 sqq.

Digitized by Google

PART III.

OLD TESTAMENT WISDOM (1).

§ 235.

General Preliminary Remarks.

THE *Old Testament wisdom* (חָכְמָה) forms, with the law and prophecy (though in co-operation with the latter), a special province of knowledge, to which three of the canonical books of the Old Testament, viz. Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, and, in virtue of their matter, many of the psalms also, pre-eminently belong. The law gives the *commandments* and *claims* of Jehovah. Prophecy proclaims the *word* of the Lord, which reveals His counsels, explains and passes judgment upon the time then present in its light, and discloses the object of God's mode of government. The Khochmah does not in an equal manner refer its matter to direct Divine causation. It is true that a wise and understanding heart is the gift of God (comp. such passages as 1 Kings iii. 12, Eccles. ii. 26), the spirit of man, the candle of the Lord (Prov. xx. 27) (2); but the proverb (מָשָׁל) of the wise is the produce of his own experience and thought, as it is so frequently expressed, and not a word of God in the stricter sense of the term (3). The position of wisdom with respect to revelation is rather as follows. Upon the soil already formed by the facts of Divine revelation and the theocratic ordinances (4), springs up not merely a practical piety, but an *impulse for knowledge*. The Israelite mind, reflecting upon the view of the world presented by revelation,

Digitized by Google

and the life-task prescribed thereby, follows up such thoughts to their consequences, and thus seeks to acquaint itself with those subjects also which are not directly determined in revelation, striving especially to obtain light concerning those enigmas and contradictions of life which are at all times obtruding themselves. Thus arises what the Old Testament calls חָכְמָה. The original signification of the root חכם being, as appears from the Arabic حكم, to make fast, to hold fast (5), the word Khochmah implies that amidst phenomena man attains to something fixed and stable, which becomes a standard for his judgment. The Old Testament Khochmah has been already designated as the *philosophy of the Hebrews*. And undoubtedly that portion of the Old Testament Scriptures which belongs to it is akin to the philosophy of other nations; for it does not concern itself with the ordinances and history of the theocracy, but takes as its subject, on the one hand, cosmical arrangements and natural life, and, on the other, the moral relations of man. Hence these two provinces of the Khochmah may be further compared with the physics and ethics of the Greeks; while, on the other hand, nothing analogous to logic is found in the Old Testament, nor even in the post-canonical Jewish wisdom (Ecclesiasticus and the Book of Wisdom), and first appears comparatively in the Talmud. Old Testament wisdom is nevertheless essentially different from other philosophy. Is is based, indeed, upon the observation of nature and of human affairs, and especially in the latter respect upon experience as handed down by the ancients; comp. how the sources of knowledge are described, Job xii. 7–12, v. 27, viii. 8 sq. (Isa. xl. 21, 28). To such investigations of nature and human life, however, it is placed under a regulator which Greek wisdom does not possess; it starts from a *supernaturalistic assumption* which is wanting to the latter. For Hellenistic philosophy seeks within the world the ultimate reasons and purposes of existence; but the knowledge of a living God transcending the world, of the almighty

Digitized by Google

Creator and Governor of the world, of the holy Lawgiver and just Judge, is among the data of Old Testament wisdom. Hence its procedure is not, as Bruch very mistakenly thinks (6), to give out a wisdom discovered independently of revelation, and thus to place itself *above* revelation (7); nor, like the later Jewish, especially the Alexandrinian, philosophy of religion, to combine a knowledge elsewhere obtained with the revealed teaching handed down to it, and to force upon the latter such interpretations as should accord with the former. Its mode of procedure, on the contrary, is to endeavour, by means of that key of knowledge which revelation affords, better to understand God's ways in the world, and, through the knowledge of God's will furnished by the law, better to determine the duties of human life. It never entered into the mind of the Old Testament sage to prove the existence of God; for, Ps. xiv., it was the fool (נָבָל) who said in his heart, There is no God. Hence, too, the ignorance with which Old Testament wisdom begins is of quite a different kind from the Socratic. Compare as chief passage in this respect the remarkable saying (Prov. xxx. 1 sqq.) of Agur, who, like Socrates, boasts of his ignorance as compared with the *μετεωρολόγους*. In ver. 1 the text must probably be altered (as Hitzig was the first to propose) to לְאִיתִי אֵל לְאִיתִי אֵל וְאֻכָל (8): "I troubled myself about God, troubled myself about God, and I vanished away," *i.e.* all his efforts to fathom the Divine Being produced nothing, so that he ironically declares himself, ver. 2 sq., superhumanly foolish (בַּעַר מֵאִישׁ), one who has no human understanding, who has not learned wisdom, nor has the knowledge of the Holy. Ver. 4 then continues: "Who hath ascended up into heaven, and descended? who hath gathered the wind in His fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is His name, and what is His son's name, if thou canst tell?" The revealed word is now referred to as the source of knowledge, ver. 5: "Every word of God is pure: He is a shield to them that put their trust in Him. *Add*

Digitized by Google

thou not unto His words, lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Thus Old Testament wisdom begins by abasing the self-sufficiency of natural knowledge, and giving glory to Divine revelation, *i.e.* it begins with the יִרְאַת יְהוָה, as it so often designates its subjective principle (comp. § 240).

(1) Having already, in the description of the times of Solomon in Pt. II. (§ 169), treated of the historical origin of the Khochmah (see also § 16 in the Introduction), we have now to lay down the essential features of its matter. Compare also my Programm: *Die Grundzüge der alttest. Weisheit*, 1854.

(2) How all human intelligence is derived from the Divine Spirit, has been already described in the doctrine of the Spirit of God (§ 65).

(3) The passage Prov. xxx. 1 forms only an apparent exception. It is probable that מַשָּׂא here and xxxi. 1 is a proper noun.

(4) We have repeatedly alluded to the fact that we have in the Old Testament revelation, comparatively little in the form of doctrine properly so called. The Divine thoughts which form its matter are for the most part impressed upon the historical facts by which it is effected, and upon the ordinances which it has enacted.

(5) See Schultens, *de defectibus hodiernis linguæ hebrææ*, p. 404 sqq. He considers the radical meaning of חָכְמָה to be *densa et firma compactio* = πυκνότης. But it is rather *a making fast*; hence حكم *dijudicavit controversiam, decrevit, potestatem exercuit.* Comp. Kimchi on 1 Kings iii. 12: אמרו ר"ול חכם המקיים את תלמודו כלומר כי מה שלמד מקויים בלבו ומזומן, *sapiens, inquiunt Rabbini nostri, quorum mem. bened. sit, ille est qui stare facit doctrinam suam, quasi dicas, quod quidquid docet, stabile est in corde ejus et paratum*; also Gusset: *sapientia non denotat cognitionem ipsam, sed modum ac gradum, quo quælibet cognitio inest animo.*

(6) See Bruch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, 1851; comp. especially p. 49.

(7) The Books of Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes not only

Digitized by Google

presuppose the validity of the law; but even where doubt contends with the doctrine of retribution taught by the law, it is overcome—in the Book of Job by the corroboration of fresh facts, and in that of Ecclesiastes by a resigned acknowledgment of the legal standpoint; comp. §§ 248, 250. (See the Programm cited.)

(8) So, too, Zöckler in his excellent Commentary on Proverbs.

§ 236.

Continuation.

But how does the Khochmah hence obtain an *objective principle of knowledge?* The Israelite mind, reflecting on the acts and ways of God as handed down, on the Divine ordinances by whose discipline it has been strengthened, and, comparing the law of Israel with the laws and statutes of heathenism, attains to the perception of their marvellous adaptation to their purpose. Comp. what is already said Deut. iv. 6 of the Mosaic precepts and statutes (§ 84, note 7). This impression of the adaptation of the law to its purpose which the Israelite mind received, is expressed in numerous passages of the Old Testament, Ps. cxlvii. 19 sq., xix. 8 sq. (1), but especially Ps. cxix., which proclaims in 176 verses the praises of the law. The Psalmist is conscious of the inexhaustible fulness which it offers to thoughtful contemplation, when he prays, ver. 18, "Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law" (2). From the perception of the adaptation of the theocratic ordinances to the purpose of their institution, the mind then advances to the thought of an *all-embracing and all-ruling purpose.* For the Lord of the theocracy is the Creator and Preserver of the universe, and the order of the covenant is based upon the order of the world. The man who is enlightened by the law, perceives in nature also a corresponding Divine adaptation to purpose; comp. *e.g.* how Ps. xix. compares the revelation of nature and the revelation of the

Digitized by Google

law. It is the same word of God proclaimed in the theocracy as law and promise, which, as a word of command, called the world into existence, and energizes in all the phenomena of nature. See the passages xxviii. 6 with ver. 4, cxlvii. 19 with ver. 15, and with cxlviii. 8, already cited in Pt. I., where the doctrine of the agency of the Divine word in creation is discussed (§ 50 with note 1, § 52 with note 3). The purposes and government of God being then recognised outside the theocracy also, the universe is regarded not as a mere product of the *power* of God, who can create what He *will* (cxv. 3, cxxxv. 6), but as the product of a systematic Divine agency. Thus arises the thought of the Divine *wisdom* as the principle of the world; and this it is which is the *objective principle* of the Khochmah. The task, then, now brought before the Israelite mind was to point out that a Divine teleology exists everywhere, even beyond the boundary defined by the theocratic ordinances,—a task to which, in prospect of the inexhaustible fulness here offered, it surrendered itself with delight. For if the Psalmist, when viewing the ways in which his own nation had been led, could exclaim, xxix. 6, "O Lord, how wondrous are Thy works! Thy thoughts are very deep!" he was also constrained, on contemplating God's other works, to exclaim, cxxiv. 24, "O Lord, how manifold are Thy works! in wisdom hast Thou made them all!" and cxxxix. 17, "How precious are Thy thoughts unto me, O God! how great is the sum of them!" (3).

(1) Ps. cxlvii. 19 sq.: "He showed His word unto Jacob, His statutes and His judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation; and as for His judgments, they have not known them." *Ib.* xix. 7 sq.: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes."

(2) Ps. cxix. is a collection of maxims, alphabetically arranged for the purpose of assisting the memory, in which a systematic

Digitized by Google

and progressive development of the several thoughts can hardly have been intended, however ingeniously the attempt to point out such a connection is made by Oetinger, Burk, and Delitzsch. On the other hand, it is certainly instructive to trace the association of ideas which may be recognised in the grouping of the separate sayings. The praise of God's word, as alone able to give peace and success; exhortations to unalterable fidelity thereto, even amidst shame and persecution; prayers to God for illumination, that God's precepts may be understood, and for strength that they may be fulfilled,—these and kindred subjects form the matter of these apothegms, which furnish an excellent testimony to the fact that a vigorous and heartfelt piety could strike root in that zeal for the law which was revived by the agency of Ezra. The psalm alludes also in several passages to the hostile opposition, and even persecution, to which fidelity to the law was exposed. (Art. *Pädagogik des A. T.*)

(3) The form peculiar to Old Testament wisdom is the מָשָׁל (proverb). This expression is applied to maxims not merely in its narrower sense of a comparison, when these sayings actually contain similitudes and figurative language, but in its more general meaning, when the experiences of life and the phenomena of nature are compared and used to illustrate each other. It is also used with still higher significance, all moral action being measured by its type, viz. the Divine will. Thus Ps. lxxviii. also is, in ver. 2, designated as a מָשָׁל, because God's dealings with Israel are therein held forth as a mirror for warning and encouragement. According to its rudimental form, as maintained in the section Prov. x. 1–xxii. 16, the mashal consists of two members, the thought expressed in the one being in the second made evident by a comparison, or completed by a more elaborate explanation, or repeated in another aspect, or elucidated either by connection with some kindred idea, or by the bringing forward of its opposite. By such a combination of an object with its image, of something unknown with that which is more current, of the particular with the general in which it is to be included, or even with other particulars, for the sake of proving by such a juxtaposition of the homogeneous the universality of the rule, the judgment and intellect are awakened, and man is accus-

Digitized by Google

tomed to observe the reasonable connection always existing between his actions and their results. The mashal requires concise and exact statement, in virtue of which it is adapted to impress itself deeply, and to remain fixed in the mind, "like goads and nails fastened," Eccles. xii. 11. This is promoted also by the versification, involving as it does such strict brevity of expression, the maxims in the collection Prov. x.–xxii. containing for the most part but seven words in both members, generally four in the first and three in the second. This purpose is also served by the recurrence of certain numbers (3, 4, 7, etc.), by an alphabetical arrangement met with in ch. xxxi. 10–13 (the description of the excellent woman), and in certain psalms, whose prevailing character is didactic (comp. especially Ps. xxxiv.). There is a rhetorical reason for the advance from lower to higher numbers (from 3 to 4, from 6 to 7) in certain numerical proverbs (Prov. vi. 16–19, xxx. 15 sq., 18–20, 21–23, 29–31), for it helps to increase the attention of the hearer, and to place the chief stress upon the last thought. The alphabetical arrangement, on the other hand, is a mere assistance to the memory, of the same kind as the numerous series of ten precepts found in the law (comp. § 85, note 5). The Proverbs, inasmuch as they arouse the moral judgment, and propound something to be found out, have also been called חִידוֹת, riddles (see especially Prov. i. 6), דִּבְרֵי חֲכָמִים וְחִידֹתָם, comp. Hab. ii. 6. That the latter expression does not merely designate the more acute form, but really means, as has been said, that something is to be found out, namely, the idea concealed behind the image, is shown by the use of the word in Judg. xiv. 12; 1 Kings x. 1; Ezek. xvii. 2; comp. also Num. xii. 8. The ethical meaning of the word, the fact that it is designed to arouse the moral judgment, is specially evident from Ps. xlix. 5, lxxviii. 2.

Digitized by Google

FIRST SECTION.

OBJECTIVE DIVINE WISDOM.

§ 237.

The part of Wisdom as an Attribute of God in the Universe. Its Personification.

That the Divine intelligence, the Divine *νοῦς*, is employed in the creation and preservation of the universe, is laid down as a general proposition in Prov. iii. 19 sq.: "The Lord by wisdom (חָכְמָה) hath founded the earth, by understanding (תְּבוּנָה) hath He established the heavens. By His knowledge (וְדַעַת) the depths are broken up, and the clouds drop down the dew." In other words, we everywhere find, as the passages cited in the preceding paragraph express it, the impress of the Divine thoughts. Though, however, in iii. 19 wisdom appears only as an attribute of God, the celebrated passage viii. 22 sqq. goes further. Wisdom is there personified, and introduced as saying, "The Lord prepared me" (not possessed me, קָנָה signifying *comparavit*) "as the beginning of His way" (*i.e.* of His working and ruling), "before His works" (קֶדֶם properly, as that which preceded His works) "of old (מֵאָז). I was set up from everlasting (1), from the beginning, or ever the earth was." Thus wisdom is brought forth before God created the world, established by Him to dispose, as Ruler of the world, of that which He has created. For it is further said: "When He prepared the heavens, I was there; when He set a circle upon the face of the deep, when He established the clouds above, when He strengthened the fountains of the deep, when He gave to the sea His decree that the waters should not pass His commandment, when He appointed the foundations of the earth, then was I (Wisdom) with Him as (אָמוֹן, *i.e.* as)

Digitized by Google

superintendent of His work (ver. 30 sq.), and I was a delight daily (2), sporting (A. V. rejoicing) always before Him, sporting upon His earth, and my delights were with the sons of men." The fact that the creative agency of God results in a glad complacency in its productions, is here represented under the image of a willing and cheerful diversion on the part of the pre-mundane Khochmah. It is, so to speak, a pleasure to the Creator to call the infinite abundance of the world into existence. Thus much, then, is certain, that even when full justice is done to the poetical element in the personification, wisdom is no longer to be regarded as a mere attribute of God, nor even as a dependent power, but as that creative, arranging, and energizing thought of the world which proceeds from God, and is objective even to Himself, or, to express it with Delitzsch in a more concrete manner, as the reflection of God's plan of the world, objective to Himself. That wisdom is objective, even with respect to God, is evident from Job xxviii. 12 sqq., the second chief passage in this matter, where, after it has been stated that man, though he is able to penetrate to the depths of the earth and bring to light hidden treasures, is yet incapable of discovering wisdom, and possessing himself of the Divine thought which determines the order of all things, ver. 23 sq. continues: "God understandeth the way thereof (*i.e.* of wisdom), and He knoweth the place thereof. For He looketh to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven." As if to say: God alone, who surveys the whole creation according to both time and space, also perfectly knows the vital law which rules it, the thought which determines the infinite variety of the world. In vers. 25–27 it is further said: "When He gave weight to the winds, and weighed the waters by measure; when He gave a law to the rain, and a way to the lightning of the thunder: then did He see her (Wisdom) and declare her (literally, numbered her), prepared her and searched her out." Here it is very evident that wisdom is the plan of the universe which proceeded from God,

Digitized by Google

the summary of those thoughts according to which all things were fashioned, and which has itself become objective to God.

Looking upon this wisdom, God causes the fulness latent therein to come forth and be developed in the world: this is implied by the expression "He numbered it." The subsequent expression, "He searched it out," alludes to the depth of the ideal contents latent in the Khochmah. In both of these chief passages (Prov. viii. and Job xxviii.) wisdom is the principle of the world laid down by God, and not a creature like the things in the world, its coming forth from God being, on the contrary, the presupposition of the world's creation (3). We cannot go further; but, as Nitzsch expresses it, we have here an unmistakeable germ of the ontological self-distinction of the Godhead. How closely the Old Testament borders upon actually regarding wisdom as a personal existence, is shown more especially by the remarkable passage, Job xv. 7 sq., where Eliphaz says to Job, "Art thou the first man that was born? Hast thou heard the secret of God? and dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?" The meaning of the question, which is of course ironical, is: Art thou then the pre-mundane wisdom of God in the form of a primitive man, who, elevated like wisdom to communion with God, hast dived into His counsels, and thus mastered the knowledge of the principle by which the world is ordered? How are we here reminded of the ὧν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Θεοῦ, and how justly has Ewald found in this passage an echo of the subsequent idea of the Logos! (4).

(1) For thus must נִסַּכְתִּי be understood, as in Ps. ii. 6, and not as, I am anointed, nor, I am produced. Let it be remembered that the derivative of נָסַךְ, נָסִיךְ, signifies the liege lord.

(2) It may be doubted whether, His delight, or, Myself full of delight. Of late the latter meaning has been chiefly accepted.

(3) Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. 1st ed. p. 90 sqq., 2d ed. p.

Digitized by Google

96 sqq., deviates considerably from this view of the passages cited. His view of Job xxviii. 20 sqq. especially is scarcely intelligible. Job is said to be speaking here not of the Divine wisdom, but only of the wisdom which man lacks; whence also the final ruin of the ungodly who now enjoy earthly prosperity is explained.

(4) Perhaps, too, the "Son" of God in Prov. xxx. 4 may also be thus explained.

§ 238.

The Old Testament View of Nature.

The doctrine of an objective Divine wisdom, just discussed, being connected with the doctrine of omnipotence, which by means of the Divine word called the world into existence and maintains it, the world is not regarded merely as the product of power, but more definitely as the product of *an almighty will ordering all in conformity with its purpose.* (Comp. how the notions of Divine wisdom and power are combined in Jer. x. 12, li. 15.) It is according to this principle that *the Old Testament view of nature* must be defined. It is true that this view also admits that the universe was raised upon a chaos (upon the restrained forces of nature). But this chaos was not (as was shown, § 50, in the doctrine of creation) a principle originally independent of God; nor did the Cosmos proceed from a struggle of the ruling principle against hostile and obscure forces, nor do such laboriously vanquished powers lurk in the background. Even in the poetical allusions to mythic representations of hostile and especially sidereal powers in Job ix. 13, xxvi. 12 sq., the latter appear as totally incapable of resisting God. The ruling omnipotence is here placed, as we have said, above all. He who said to the sea, when it issued forth from the womb of the earth, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall the pride of thy waves be stayed," xxxviii. 11, is He who has subjected all that is in

Digitized by Google

heaven and on earth to His חֻקָּה, to His laws (ver. 33, comp. Jer. xxxi. 35, xxxiii. 35), and who makes the course of nature subserve His purpose. This purpose is, to speak generally (see § 53), the manifestation of the Divine glory. Hence the whole course of the universe, from the hour of creation, when, according to Job xxxviii. 7, the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy, has been of a continuous song of praise of this glory of God, a song in which all earthly creatures unite in one choir with the heavenly host, Ps. cxlviii. But the order of nature is further placed in close *connection with the moral order of the world.* What the Mosaic doctrine of retribution teaches (see vol. i. § 89) concerning this connection, viz. that the course of nature subserves the purposes of Divine justice, is maintained to its full extent in the Khochmah. It may here suffice to refer to the description in Job xxxvii. 12 sq., where God stands as it were in the midst of the elementary forces which rule in the storm, and where it is said: "It is turned round about by His counsels, that they may do whatsoever He commandeth them throughout the world, down to the earth. He causeth it to come (upon the earth), whether for a rod, or for the land, or for mercy" (1).

And yet that glory of God which man perceives in the world, that teleological connection which he recognises therein, is but a small portion of the whole, but a weak reflection of that glory. He finds, indeed, everywhere traces of the Divine wisdom, but he is not capable, as above remarked (§ 237), of fully comprehending it, Job xxxviii. The very abundance of that which he does know, makes him conscious that an infinitely greater abundance escapes his knowledge. "Lo, these are the *ends*, קְצוֹת, the barest outlines, as it were, of His ways; and what is the whisper which we perceive, and the thunder of His power who can understand?" are the words with which one of the most sublime descriptions in the Book of Job concludes (xxvi. 14, comp. xi. 7 sq.). The whole course of interrogation to which Job was subjected was calculated to bring

Digitized by Google

him to a consciousness of the limits of human wisdom even in natural things, and especially with respect to the paradoxes of natural phenomena.

(1) The contents of many of the psalms touch on this matter, especially Ps. civ., to which I will not here further refer.

§ 239.

The Intervention of Wisdom in Human Affairs.

Not only nature, but human affairs, are controlled by wisdom as an objective Divine principle. That same wisdom which is the governing principle of the universe, has taken up its abode on earth, and rules as a sovereign all the events of life, in which a Divine design, and therefore Divine intelligence, is everywhere perceptible. And this is true without regard to the theocracy, with which the wisdom of the canonical books of the Old Testament does not concern itself. It is in the post-canonical monuments of Hebrew wisdom that we first find the objective wisdom regarded also as the principle of revelation in the stricter sense. It is already thus viewed in the Book of Ecclesiastes, where, in ch. xxiv. 10 sqq., the presence of the Shechinah in the sanctuary is exchanged for the dwelling of the Divine wisdom upon Mount Zion. Wherever law and government are found upon earth, they are an outcome of the Khochmah. "By me," it is introduced as saying, Prov. viii. 16, "princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges upon earth." Very significantly is wisdom, when making itself known to men, called, Prov. i. 20, ix. 1, חָכְמוֹת, which must not be regarded, as by Ewald and Zöckler, as a singular form for חָכְמָה, for חָכְמוֹת is construed not merely as a singular, but also as a plural. The expression denotes rather that the Divine wisdom includes all kinds of wisdom, and therefore especially the moral forces by which human life is directed. This Khochmah,

Digitized by Google

according to ix. 1 sqq., builds her house with seven pillars, and sends forth her maidens to the high places of the city to invite to her banquet. She herself also appears, i. 20 sqq., in the streets and public places of the town, and calls the ignorant to come unto her. This may, as already remarked, § 169, refer in the first place to the fact that in the public places, where justice was administered and public business transacted, sages were wont to address and prophets to preach, etc.; but it also implies generally that the appeals of Divine wisdom are ever being uttered to man in all human transactions, and even in the ordinary events of life; that to all who will but see and hear, the wise, righteous, and holy government of God makes itself evident. If we inquire more closely *as to the means by which wisdom makes her appeal to man*, i. 23 again points to those principles of revelation, the word and the Spirit: "Behold, I will pour out my *Spirit* upon you; I will make known my *words* unto you." And truly the word is the vehicle of the Spirit. The effect of this upon men is first designated as *instruction*, מוּסָר. The notion of instruction is one of the fundamental ideas of the Proverbs of Solomon,—one of the seven pillars, as Oetinger says (ix. 1), upon which the house of wisdom is supported. Wisdom and instruction are inseparably connected, i. 2, 7, xxiii. 23; the way to wisdom is called, i. 3, a reception of instruction (xix. 20). The preservation of wisdom is only possible by taking fast hold of instruction, iv. 13, x. 17, etc. The idea of מוּסָר must by no means be weakened, as is often the case, to the notion of *doctrina*, *institutio*, since it is already evident from iii. 11 that the word is also used for the discipline of sorrow, in xiii. 24, xxii. 15, for the correction of children, and that instruction begins with תּוֹכַחַת. תּוֹכַחַת, from הוֹכִיחַ = ἐλέγχειν, is the admonition, which both convinces and rebukes, of i. 23, xxv. 30, and many subsequent passages. For the connection of the two notions, see iii. 11, v. 12, x. 17, xii. 1, xiii. 18, xv. 5, and elsewhere. Consequently it is with this instruction or reproof that the educa-

Digitized by Google

tional agency of wisdom upon man must begin; for man is by nature ignorant of the way of salvation, and easily seduced to evil, or, as the expression is, פְּתִי (*i.e.* one standing open), *simple;* comp. i. 4, 22, and other passages. Hence the worthlessness of his natural efforts must be revealed to him by the light of God's law, and he must be convinced of the perniciousness of those ungodly ways in which he is walking. He who will not be convinced, who in his self-sufficiency will not receive the reproofs of instruction, nay, hates them, shows himself thereby to be a *fool*, כְּסִיל (אֱוִיל), nay בַּעַר, xii. 1, brutish, and is in his incorrigibleness hastening to irretrievable ruin (i. 24 sqq., xiii. 18, etc.). He, on the other hand, who fears God, submits to this reproof of instruction, resolutely turns from those evil ways to which his natural inclinations and the evil example of others seek to seduce him, and so walks in the way of wisdom, i. 8 sqq.; and thus, while following up the proceedings of objective wisdom, we have again arrived at its subjective result.

SECOND SECTION.

SUBJECTIVE HUMAN WISDOM.

§ 240.

The Fear of the Lord the Subjective Principle of Wisdom.

The subjective principle of wisdom is, then, the fear of the Lord: יִרְאַת יְהוָה רֵאשִׁית דַּעַת, Prov. i. 7; תְּחִלַּת חָכְמָה יִרְאַת יְהוָה, ix. 10; comp. Ps. cxi. 10, Job xxviii. 28. This fear of the Lord is not, as Hegel, *e.g.*, has defined it (1), a blind, gloomy, passive religious emotion, produced merely by the idea of an absolute power which utterly negatives human nature as such,—a definition applicable to the fear of God only in the sense of Islam, a system which renounces all free self-determination. The fear of Jehovah is far rather, as it is called Prov. ix. 10, דַּעַת

Digitized by Google

קְדֹשִׁים, "*the knowledge of the All-Holy.*" The Divine holiness, however, is, as was shown in Pt. I. (§ 45), absolute perfection, not merely in the sense of separateness from all created beings, and incomparable exaltation above them, in virtue of which it passes the sentence of vanity upon all that is finite, but still more decidedly in that of separateness from all the impurity and sinfulness of the creature. But it is not this alone; for God, as the Holy One, is not only separate from the world, but also imparts Himself thereto, for the purpose of abolishing its sin, and giving it a share in His perfection; in pursuance of which design He has sanctified to Himself a people, *i.e.* separated them from the world and taken them as a possession, and these He leads and governs in conformity with His plan of salvation.

This Divine holiness addresses itself, in that law which reveals the perfect will of God, to the free will of man. Consequently the fear of the Lord, as the knowledge of the All-Holy, has nothing to do with this gloomy passivity; but—presupposing the covenant relation into which He has entered with His people—is based upon that will of God which opposes all selfish and sinful human efforts, and appoints, in conformity to His purpose of salvation, an end and measure to all things, and it is the dread of disobeying this holy will of God. Hence it involves, according to the just definition of its moral characteristics, viii. 13, "hatred of evil, pride, arrogancy, and the evil way." From this fear of God proceeds also the effort, first, to *perceive* in everything the end designed by the Divine will; and, secondly, to realize it in every action, as it is said, ch. iii. 6, "In all thy ways acknowledge Him." The former may be called theoretical, the latter practical wisdom. Thus the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom, whose starting-point accordingly is not the autonomy of the reason and the will, which would be that very leaning on our own understanding, that being wise in our own eyes, against which we are so earnestly warned, *e.g.* iii. 5. 7 (comp. xii. 15, etc.). The wise

Digitized by Google

man, on the contrary, shares in the restraints and obligations imposed on the servants of God (2), and is at all times and under all circumstances conscious of them. It is in this sense that it is said, xxviii. 14, "Happy is the man that feareth always (מְפַחֵד תָּמִיד)," *i.e.*, lest he transgress the will of God, in contrast with the מַקְשֶׁה לִבּוֹ, the man who hardens himself against God's commands in the service of sin. The wise man's servitude is not, however, a slavish one, but rather a relation of intimacy with God, Ps. xxv. 14. The friendship (*familiaritas*) of the Lord is for them that fear Him (סוֹד יְהוָה לִירֵאָיו), with which compare the saying in Prov. iii. 32 (אֶת־יְשָׁרִים סוֹדוֹ).

(1) See Hegel's *Darstellung des Judenthums* in his *Religions Philosophie*, ii. 1st ed. p. 67 sq., 2d ed. p. 79 sq.

(2) חָכָם and עֶבֶד יְהוָה are generally interchangeable terms.

§ 241.

Practical Wisdom.

Subjective wisdom, though by no means excluding theoretical questions (1), is yet for the most part *practical*, and bent upon accomplishing the holy will of God in human life. Since, however, this will of God aims not only at the external consecration of the life, but also at the *sanctification of the heart and temper* (2), the ethics of the Old Testament doctrine of wisdom do not treat only, as has been so often supposed, of a restoration of an external legality of conduct. The following comparison of passages from both may suffice to show that there is in this respect no difference between the Psalms and the precepts of the Khochmah. The Psalmist, Ps. cxxxix. 23, prays to the all-knowing God: "Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts." And David says, li. 6: "Behold, Thou desirest truth in the inward parts, and in *the hidden* part Thou shalt

Digitized by Google

make me know wisdom," which probably refers to inward sincerity and purity (3); and prays to God for forgiveness of sin, for inward cleansing and renewing, that this state of heart may be induced; and, finally, in Ps. xxxii., penitent confession of sin and the seeking of pardon from God are required as the indispensable conditions of the way of salvation, and their opposites designated as brutish irrationality. With all this the ethics of the Book of Proverbs entirely agree, by seeking to arouse the fear of God, the all-seeing Searcher of hearts, as the following passages show: (xv. 11) "Hell and destruction are before the Lord; how much more, then, the hearts of the children of men?" (xvi. 2) "All the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes; but the Lord weigheth (תֹּכֵן) the spirits," *i.e.* tests them according to their value; (xvii. 3) "The fining pot is for silver, and the furnace for gold; but the Lord trieth the hearts." Among the seven things that the Lord hateth is, vi. 18, "a heart that deviseth wicked imaginations." In xx. 9 conviction of sin is required: "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?"—words which are not to be explained: I have from my birth maintained purity of heart, but which deny (Zöckler) man's purity and freedom from sin, as expressed Eccles. vii. 20: "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not." Hence Prov. xxviii. 13 declares the duty of *confessing sin*, and the happiness of obtaining *forgiveness:* "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." Sacrifice, as a mere *opus operatum*, is rejected, xv. 8: "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord" (xxi. 27), comp. xxi. 3 (4); as it is also said, Eccles. v. 1, that to go into the house of God to hear is better than when fools bring a sacrifice. Thus it is evident why, among the exhortations in Prov. iv. 23 sqq., this is placed first: "Keep thy *heart* with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life;" *i.e.*, as the heart, whence the blood flows, and to which it returns, is the abode of physical life, so with respect to man's moral life, everything,

Digitized by Google

after all, depends upon the heart, the disposition of man. Then follow the precepts: "Put away from thee a froward mouth, and perverse lips put far from thee," etc. The catalogue of Job's virtues in Job xxxi., from which, indeed, as is characteristically consistent with the progress of the poem, humility is absent, bears nevertheless testimony to the inwardness with which man's moral duty was regarded (5).

(1) A proof of this is already contained in the First Section (§ 237), where the doctrine of the Divine wisdom as the principle of the arrangement of the world is discussed. In the Fourth Section it will be further shown how Old Testament wisdom, following up the thought of the law, arrives at metaphysical problems, and produces a religious speculation, which struggles to break through the limits of Old Testament revelation, and to work its way to a higher knowledge.

(2) Comp. the doctrine of the law, § 84.

(3) I now thus explain Ps. li. 6 with the most recent expositors, though it is otherwise regarded in p. 10 of the Programme, on the disclosure of the deeper meaning of the law, already cited.

(4) Prov. xxi. 3: "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice;" in which passage, however, as well as in kindred passages from the Psalms and Prophets, no absolute rejection of sacrificial service is expressed; comp. § 201 (see Programme cited).

(5) This chapter contains many parallels with the Sermon on the Mount.

§ 242.

Continuation.

Notwithstanding what has been said, it must be confessed that the wisdom of the Proverbs is chiefly occupied with the sphere of the *external* life, and that its main purpose is to point out, in all the relations of civil and domestic life, down to the circumstances of ordinary intercourse, the course of action

Digitized by Google

conformable to the will of God, and thus to apply the saying, Prov. iii. 6: בְּכָל־דְּרָכֶיךָ דָעֵהוּ, "In all thy ways *Deum respice et cura*." The wise man proves himself to be such by living like one who is constantly reflecting on the purposes of God. Hence בִּינָה, the gift of discerning between good and evil, harmful and salutary; מְזִמָּה, the intelligence always able to advise aright; עָרְמָה, cunning in its nobler sense of skill in the choice of the means best fitted to the end in view,—are declared to be the prominent virtues of the wise. The property mentioned i. 5, תַּחְבֻּלוֹת, the art of steering, the power of wisely directing one's course of life, is very characteristic. The ethics of the Proverbs are certainly, in virtue of their principle, viz. the fear of violating God's will, of an undeniably *negative character*, and present, by reason of the constant reflection upon the end designed by that will which they require, an appearance of coldness and extreme moderation. The impulsive power of love is wanting as a motive (comp. § 84). We should seek in vain in Proverbs for such sayings as, "I heartily love Thee, O Lord, my strength," Ps. xviii. 1 (lxxiii. 25 sq.), etc. Enthusiasm is alien to the sage, as possibly involving an element unsuited to the purpose to be attained; while everything tending to disturb the prescribed equilibrium—all rashness and precipitation—are utterly detested by him. It is said, xiv. 15: "The simple believeth every word; but the prudent (עָרוּם) looketh well to his going;" xiv. 29: "He that is slow to wrath is of great understanding; but he that is hasty of spirit showeth much folly." Hence it is chiefly his words and gestures which the wise man must control,—xi. 12 sq.: "He that is void of wisdom manifests contempt for his neighbour; but a man of understanding holdeth his peace. A talebearer revealeth secrets; but he that is of a faithful spirit concealeth the matter;" x. 10: "He that winketh with the eye (a gesture expressing derision) causeth sorrow; and a prating fool shall fall (rushes to destruction)." Death and life are declared, xviii. 21, to be in the power of the tongue. In consequence of this negative character, it is

Digitized by Google

rather justice than love which is the duty a man owes to his *neighbour*; nay, it has already been made a matter of reproach against the ethics of these maxims, that they sometimes border upon the recommendation of a selfish prudence. It must not, however, be forgotten, in considering those frequent warnings against suretyship, vi. 1–4, xi. 15, 17, xviii. 22, 26 sq., which are here referred to, that in the then existing state of law, indiscretion in this respect might involve even the loss of personal liberty. In quite another degree than the Book of Proverbs does the son of Sirach, in the midst of many admirable precepts, appeal in an actually offensive manner to selfish motives. Nor is the former book without numerous maxims which relate to the practice of those duties resulting from the principle of love, placability being inculcated, *e.g.*, x. 12; the love of enemies, xxv. 21 sq.; peaceableness, xvii. 14, xx. 3; gentleness and patience, xv. 1, 18; forbearance to the poor, xxii. 22. In impressing which last named virtue, it is expressly stated that their Creator is honoured in the poor, xiv. 31, xvii. 3 (1). The nature of the man who devotes himself to wisdom is designated by the word תּוּשִׁיָּה. This expression, which is peculiar to the Khochmah, is derived from יֵשׁ (*ὑπάρχειν*), and consequently properly denotes *essentiality*, *reality*. It is used in both a subjective and objective sense,—in the former, parallel with חָכְמָה, along with עֵצָה, מְזִמָּה, בִּינָה, גְּבוּרָה, comp. such passages as iii. 21, viii. 14; in an objective sense with עֶזְרָה, help, Job vi. 13, and with מָגֵן, shield, Prov. ii. 7. The expression is used to signify that, while fools consume themselves in vain efforts, and hence obtain only that which is worthless, the wise man, on the contrary, contemplating and striving after that which is real and lasting (2), also obtains possession of that which is solid and enduring. And this brings us to the statement of what that good is wherein the reward of wisdom consists.

(1) Similar passages will be found in the 31st chapter of the Book of Job, quoted in the preceding §.

Digitized by Google

(2) Because the Divine purpose is that which alone is stable, and the wise man alone aims at this purpose. "There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand."

THIRD SECTION.

MORAL GOOD.

§ 243.

Its Realization in the Individual Life.

The teaching of the Khochmah concerning the possession of earthly good is entirely based upon the Mosaic doctrine of retribution. What this expresses as the *shall* of promise and threatening, is announced in Proverbs as a fact, and that with the assurance arising from direct *experience*. Comp. *e.g.* xiii. 21: "Evil pursueth sinners; but to the righteous good shall be repaid;" ver. 9: "The light of the righteous rejoiceth; but the lamp of the wicked is put out." A number of sayings on this subject are found in the speeches of the three friends of Job, whose very aim it is to exhibit the actual reality of the Divine law of retribution. The sum-total of earthly good is life, its opposite death; and these are often contrasted with each other, *e.g.* Prov. viii. 35 sq., where Wisdom says: "Whoso findeth me findeth life: . . . . he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death." Comp. xi. 19, also xiii. 14: "The teaching of the wise is a fountain of life, to depart from the snares of death." That this life, which is the reward of wisdom, is regarded both in Proverbs and in the legal doctrine of retribution as earthly and of this world, is generally admitted; the question, however, is whether the *teaching of Proverbs is limited thereto*. Ewald, in particular, asserts the contrary; Proverbs teaching also, in his opinion, of a happy life in another world. And here it must first of all be

Digitized by Google

regarded as worthy of notice that the Proverbs only make mention of Sheol, the realm of shades (רְפָאִים), when speaking of the final lot of the wicked. It is thither that the paths of the adulteress lead, ii. 18, v. 5, vii. 27, ix. 18; while not a word is said about the good and holy also entering Sheol. Nay, there are even positive statements which appear to raise the wise above this doom. The first of these passages is xii. 28: "In the way of righteousness is life, and in its pathway (וְדֶרֶךְ נְתִיבָה) is non-death" (אַל־מָוֶת, that is, as Ewald says, immortality). We might indeed have expected לֹא מָוֶת. Hitzig and Zöckler, on the contrary, read with the LXX. אָל, and explain the clause, But a by-path (?) leads to death (1). A second passage is xiv. 32: "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness; but the righteous hath hope in his death" (בְּמוֹתוֹ). But here the LXX. have another reading, their text probably having been בְּחָמְוֹ ("has confidence in his innocence"), which would hinder the passage from furnishing any evidence in this matter. Another is xv. 20, the translation of which is certain: "The way of life is upwards to the wise, to escape hell beneath." Also when it is said, xi. 7: "When a wicked man dieth, his expectation shall perish; and the hope of the unjust perisheth," does it not seem to be pointed out, that when a just man dieth, his hope does not perish, which is indeed interpolated by the LXX. as the first clause of ver. 7 ? (2). According to the Masoretic text, however, the contrast is found in ver. 8: "The righteous is delivered out of trouble; and the wicked cometh in his stead." The circumstance, however, which especially makes such an explanation doubtful is, that just in these and similar passages, where the notion of life as the reward of wisdom is so clearly stated, there is not even a trace of an allusion to a future and better life. In iii. 18, *e.g.*, wisdom is, with evident reference to Gen. ii. 9, iii. 22, declared to be a tree of life; but its fruit is subsequently represented, ver. 16 (see below), not as eternal life, but only as length of days (אֹרֶךְ יָמִים), and the contrast to the passage Prov. ii. 18 sq., where it is said of the adulteress,

Digitized by Google

"Her house inclineth unto death, and her paths unto the dead: none that go unto her . . . take hold of the paths of life" (comp. ver. 6); is only (ver. 21) "the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it," while the wicked are to be rooted out. Compare also x. 30 and other passages (3). Accordingly, the passages xii. 28 and xv. 24, even if the Masoretic punctuation of the former is adopted, only refer to the Divine promise of a long and prosperous earthly life; while the passage xiv. 32*b*, if the Masoretic text is accepted, must be explained either of the trust of the righteous in the midst even of extreme peril, or of such a confidence on the part of the dying righteous man in the future prosperity of his descendants, as Jacob manifested, Gen. xlix. 18, or in the continuance of his memory in the sense of Prov. x. 7 (4). The passages brought forward by Ewald from the Proverbs are of the same kind as many in the Psalms which were referred by older theologians to life eternal, as xxvii. 3: "To see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living;" cxlii. 5: "Thou art my refuge and my portion in the land of the living,"—which interpretation has been long considered erroneous. Still it is remarkable that the Book of Proverbs draws, so to speak, a veil over the state of the righteous in Hades. Generally speaking, however, it is certain, as already remarked, that wisdom proffers earthly possessions: "Length of days is in her right hand, and in her left, riches and honour."

Hence the doctrine of the Khochmah has already been designated as pure Eudemonism, as teaching that wisdom and righteousness are but means for the attainment of earthly prosperity as the proper object of life. The state of the matter is, however, as follows. As even the legal doctrine of retribution culminates, according to Lev. xxvi. 3 sqq., in the promise of the dwelling of God among His people, of the direct intercourse into which He will enter with them, and as consequently there can be from the Mosaic standpoint no earthly prosperity apart from communion with God (see § 89); so also does

Digitized by Google

wisdom, in virtue of its principle, the fear of God, repudiate all earthly aims and interests, *in so far as these, apart from the Divine purpose and pursued for their own sake,* constitute the end for which man lives. It could not, in fact, be more decidedly stated than in the Book of Proverbs how culpable it is to make earthly prosperity, in and for itself, the object of life. Comp. the following statements on riches: xi. 4, 28, xv. 16, etc. (5). In what sense, then, is it that earthly possessions are, on the other hand, brought forward as things to be striven after? In the following. That while it would be folly to seek them for their own sake, it is, on the contrary, wisdom to seek them as a good consistent with, and involved in, the Divine purposes; that they are to be received as tokens and pledges of the Divine *complacency,* as a blessing which God has combined with righteousness as its reward, and consequently that God is to be honoured by them. It is in this manner that all, even the seemingly contradictory passages of the Proverbs, are to be harmonized, viz. those which on the one side declare wisdom to be the most desirable of all possessions, more precious than pearls, and incomparably surpassing all that can be desired, iii. 15 comp. with xvi. 16, etc., and those which, on the other side, value earthly prosperity, praising *e.g.* the righteous because there is much treasure in his house, xv. 6, etc. The fine passage xxx. 7–9 (6) may especially be mentioned, as showing how earthly prosperity is ever prized only in proportion as it is accompanied by godly and righteous conduct.

(1) Vulg. *iter autem devium ducit ad mortem;* in corroboration of which, Judg. v. 6, where נְתִיבוֹת, as contrasted with אֳרְחוֹת, means by-ways, and Jer. xviii. 15, where דֶּרֶךְ לֹא סְלֻלָה corresponds with נְתִיבוֹת, may certainly be appealed to. But the word signifies simply a small footpath; hence it is questionable whether it ought to be taken in so pregnant a sense.

(2) Prov. xi. 7*a*, LXX.: *τελευτήσαντος ἀνδρὸς δικαίου οὐκ ὄλλυται ἐλπίς.* Zöckler, too, finds this meaning in the passage.

Digitized by Google

(3) Prov. x. 30: "The righteous shall never be removed; but the wicked shall not inhabit the land" (comp. ver. 25); ver. 27: "The fear of the Lord prolongeth days; but the years of the wicked shall be shortened."

(4) Prov. x. 7: "The memory of the just is blessed; but the name of the wicked shall rot."

(5) Prov. xi. 4: "Riches profit not in the day of wrath; but righteousness delivereth from death;" ver. 28: "He that trusteth in his riches shall fall; but the righteous shall flourish as a branch;" xv. 16: "Better is little with the fear of the Lord, than great treasure and trouble therewith." It is easy to find many more proverbs of this kind.

(6) Prov. xxx. 7–9: "Two things have I required of Thee, deny me them not before I die: Remove far from me vanity and lies; give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me: lest I be full, and deny Thee, and say, Who is the Lord? or lest I be poor, and steal, and take the name of my God in vain."

§ 244.

Realization of Moral Good in the various Social Spheres. The View taken in Proverbs of Evil and Pain.

Moral good is not realized in individual life alone, but in the various social spheres. And here it is first of all the sphere of family, of domestic life, that claims our consideration, domestic happiness being the chief of those good things which reward the fear of God. Both the *conjugal* and the *parental* relations are regarded by the Khochmah with a religious and moral seriousness nowhere else paralleled among the nations of antiquity. Marriage is designated, Prov. ii. 17, as a covenant of God (1). "House and riches are the inheritance of fathers; but a prudent wife is from the Lord," xix. 14 (2); comp. also xii. 4, xviii. 22 (3). The description of such a wife, xxxi. 10 sqq., terminates, ver. 30, with the words, "Favour is deceit-

Digitized by Google

ful, and beauty is vain; but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised." No sin is more frequently or more sharply reproved in Proverbs than the violation of conjugal fidelity; see ii. 12 sqq., ch. v., vi. 23 sqq., and the entire seventh chapter. *Solomon's Song* may also be referred to; for even if it is not regarded as a satire on polygamy, it very decidedly views conjugal love as a unique relation when compared with the polygamy which it presupposes, vi. 9, and speaks, viii. 6, of a love strong as death, whose jealousy is as hard as the grave, whose coals are coals of fire, a flame of the Lord. With this corresponds the appreciation of the *blessing of children.* Descendants are indeed the glory of a house (4), but only, as is frequently stated, when children are wise and walk in the fear of God; see Prov. x. 1, xvii. 21, xxiii. 24, xxvii. 11, etc. (5). Hence it is expressly required that children should be carefully trained, by strict discipline and religious and moral instruction (6).

Not only domestic but *political* life, and *well-ordered civil institutions*, are regarded as component parts of moral good. All earthly authority is, as already remarked (§ 239), an emanation of the Divine wisdom. The view that kings and judges are the organs of the Divine government of the world, and vicegerents of the Supreme Ruler and Judge, and that as such they are appointed to administer justice, especially by executing severe judgment upon the wicked, forms the foundation of a whole series of proverbs; comp. xvi. 12–15, xx. 8, 26, xxv. 5, xxix. 4 (7). For "where there is no guidance (תַּחְבֻּלוֹת), a nation falls," xi. 14. The prosperity of a nation, however, depends upon its possession of the word of God, of the law and prophecy. "Where there is no prophecy, the people perish; but he that keepeth the law, happy is he," xxix. 18 (8). All political wisdom is comprised in the saying: "Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproof to any people," xiv. 34. In xxviii. 12, 15 sq., we are told how a blessing or a curse falls upon a people, according to the cha-

Digitized by Google

racter of its government. Hence numerous good counsels are given to kings, *e.g.* xxix. 12, 14: "If a ruler hearken unto lies, all his servants are wicked. The king that faithfully judgeth the poor, his throne shall be established for ever." Comp. also xxxi. 1–9, etc.

When every department of life thus combines to subserve the Divine purpose, the Israelite mind feels satisfied. That there is so much *evil* in the world, is indeed a thought which disturbs it when contemplating the beauty and order of the universe, comp. Ps. civ. 35 (§ 53); but evil being regarded in its connection with that Divine judgment that awaits it and manifests the justice and holiness of God, becomes itself an element of the Divine teleology: "The Lord hath made all things for Himself, yea, even the wicked for the day of evil," Prov. xvi. 4. Those irregularities which do not harmonize with the Mosaic doctrine of retribution, are reconciled by their connection with the whole; the *suffering*, from which the wise and righteous is not exempt, working as a means of Divine discipline for his good. The proverb iii. 11 sq. says: "My son, despise not the chastening of the Lord, neither be weary of His correction; for whom the Lord loveth He correcteth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth" (9). There is no trace here of that heart-agitating conflict depicted in the Book of Job. This is not to say that the contradictions which Old Testament life bears within itself are reconciled. Its due value is assigned to the finite, inasmuch as a part in the Divine arrangements is assigned to it, but it is not completely denied in its finity. As the possession of the wise, it is placed in a different point of view to that from which the fool and the ungodly contemplate it, but it does not subserve the realization of man's eternal destiny. Of this eternal destiny the Khochmah of the Proverbs is not able to speak, at least with clearness (10), and does but draw a veil over death and Sheol. But Old Testament wisdom was also destined to detect these unreconciled contradictions, and to fight out such a mental conflict as has been fought out by the

Digitized by Google

wisdom of no other nation. How this detection and consequent struggle arose, will next demand our attention.

(1) *I.e.*, as a covenant entered into before God and with His intervention. Thus Hitzig aptly quotes by way of illustration the saying of Jonathan, 1 Sam. xx. 23: "And as touching the matter which thou and I have spoken of, behold, the Lord be between thee and me for ever." Comp. Mal. ii. 14 (§ 102). That marriages, as Ewald *in loc.* thinks, were not concluded without the sacred rites of the public religion, cannot be proved from the Old Testament.

(2) *I.e.*, as Hitzig again well and briefly remarks, marriages are made in heaven.

(3) According to Prov. xviii. 22, to have found a good wife is a token of the Divine favour.

(4) Comp. Prov. xvii. 6: "Children's children are the crown of old men."

(5) Prov. x. 1: "A wise son maketh a glad father; but a foolish son is the heaviness of his mother;" xvii. 21: "He that begetteth a fool, doeth it to his sorrow; and the father of a fool hath no joy;" xxiii. 24: "The father of the righteous shall greatly rejoice, and he that begetteth a wise child shall have joy of him;" xxvii. 11: "My son, be wise, and make my heart glad, that I may answer him that reproacheth me;" in other words, well brought up children are the best vindication of a father against the attacks of slanderers. Comp. also xxviii. 7, xxix. 3.

(6) The standard example for *the education of children* is the educational agency of Divine wisdom (see § 239). This is divided into two parts,—*discipline*, taking the word in its narrower sense, and *instruction*, on which account it is required of the teacher that he should himself apply his heart to discipline, and his ears to the words of knowledge, Prov. xxiii. 12. For this saying forms the introduction to vers. 13–16; and Oetinger correctly states the connection to be, "As thou bringest up thyself, so wilt thou also bring up thy children." Above all is the natural evil inclination of the child, "the foolishness which is bound in the heart of a child" (xxii. 15), to be restrained by strict *discipline*. "The rod and reproof give wisdom; but a

Digitized by Google

child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame" (xxix. 15). Stripes, which are spoken of as a fit means for encountering folly and wickedness in general (x. 13, xx. 30), are repeatedly demanded for the chastisement of children. He who spares the rod is said to hate the child; while true love for it is manifested by strict discipline, because the child is thereby saved from ruin, xiii. 24, xxiii. 13 sq. "Correct thy son, and he shall give thee rest; yea, he shall give delight unto thy soul" (xxix. 17). A distinction is, however, made between the case in which verbal reproof and that in which corporal chastisement is required: "A reproof entereth more into a wise man than an hundred stripes into a fool" (xvii. 10); "Smite a scorner, and the simple will beware; and reprove one that hath understanding, and he will understand knowledge" (xix. 25). The knowledge, then, for the reception of which discipline is to open the understanding, is of a religious and moral nature; and the *instruction* spoken of in the Proverbs is designed to lead to the knowledge and fear of God, whence proceeds the understanding of righteousness, judgment, and equity, and every good path (comp. as chief passage, ii. 1–9). The young are to be instructed in the Divine word. This word of God is not yet asserted by Proverbs to be the written word; it was rather received by a son from the *mouth* of his parents. The commands of parents have the authority of the Divine law; and the promises made to the fulfilment of the Divine commandments depend upon its fulfilment. Comp. i. 8, "My son, hear the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the law of thy mother," where the combination of reverence for parents with the principle of the fear of God expressed ver. 7 should be observed. Also iv. 3 sq.: "I was my father's son, tender and only beloved in the sight of my mother" (*i.e.* the true relation which ought to exist between parents and children was found in me). "He taught me also, and said unto me, Let thy heart retain my words; keep my commandments, and live." Comp. also vi. 20 sqq., where it should be remarked that the law of the mother is placed side by side with the commandment of the father, and a share in the moral and religious training of the son thus secured to the former. In this passage, what was said Deut. vi. 7 (§ 105, with note 6) of the keeping of the Divine law is transferred to parental instruction. "Bind them continually

Digitized by Google

upon thine heart, and tie them about thy neck. When thou goest, it shall lead thee; when thou sleepest, it shall keep thee; and when thou awakest, it shall talk with thee" (or perhaps more correctly, "make thee reflect," *i.e.* it shall be thy first thought in the morning). Disobedience to parents entails heavy judgments, the doom of the transgressor awaiting him who despises them (xxx. 17, comp. xx. 20). Parents are also warned to begin the instruction of their children betimes, and thus to train them for their whole life: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." Special regard is to be had to the doings of a child, since by them it may be perceived "whether his nature be pure, and whether it be right" (xx. 11). In such subjection of youth to a sacred authority, that strict discipline of law by which God trains His people is repeated: "It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth" (Lam. iii. 27). A complete statement of the educational precepts given in the Proverbs would here be out of place. It may suffice to point out, in addition to what has already been said, how earnestly *diligence* is insisted on, and sloth despised as a contemptible thing (vi. 6–11, x. 26, xv. 19, xix. 15, 24, xx. 4, 13, xxvi. 13–16); how *temperance* (xiii. 25, xxiii. 19–21) and *chastity* are required, and temptations to unchastity warned against (vii. 5 sqq., xxiii. 26–28). On the position taken by Old Testament pedagogy with respect to bodily exercise, see the article quoted in Schmid's *Pädagogischer Encyklop.* v. p. 683. The education of *girls* is never separately treated on in Proverbs. It is a self-evident assumption that they too were instructed in the law, though this is first expressly stated in the apocryphal Book of Susannah, ver. 3. The end contemplated in female education may be perceived from the description of the excellent woman in Prov. xxxi. 10 sqq., and the passages xi. 16, 22, xii. 4, etc. Modesty and moral tact (טַעַם, xi. 22; Hitzig: "An acute sense of decorum, chiefly manifested in modesty of speech, look, and conduct") are the ornaments of woman. Isa. iii. 16 sqq. is an earnest reproof of the daughters of Zion for their pride, luxury, and love of dress. Constant occupation, industry, benevolence, and liberality are the chief features of the description Prov. xxxi., which also shows that skill in handiwork of all kinds was then a part of female education. But here also the instruction of

Digitized by Google

wisdom is true to its principle, ver. 30 (see above). For the literature of Old Testament pedagogy, see the article cited, p. 653 sq.

(7) Comp. Stier, who has written separate works on two sections of the Proverbs, one on ch. xxv. sqq., with the title, *Der Weise ein König*, the other on ch. xxx. sq., with that of *Die Politik der Weisheit*.

(8) In these passages each member must be completed by the other.

(9) The prosperity of the age of Solomon is reflected in the peace and rest shed over the life of the wise.

(10) This conclusion must be arrived at even according to the most favourable explanation of the passages discussed.

FOURTH SECTION.

THE ENIGMAS OF HUMAN LIFE. THE STRUGGLE FOR THEIR SOLUTION (1).

§ 245.

The Enigmas themselves.

That which above all else gave rise to the struggle between faith and doubt, was the perception that the actual course of events did not harmonize with the *postulates of the doctrine of retribution*,—that the God who judges righteously did not make His righteous judgment evident in what befell either nations or individuals. The Israelite mind was the less able to turn to fatalistic consolations, because in its view the reality of the idea of God coincided with the reality of the ordinance of retribution, and the denial of the latter would result in atheism. It was indeed the very characteristic of the wicked, that while he said in his pride, "God will not requite it," he really meant, "There is no God;" comp. passages such as Ps. x. 4 sq., xiv. 1. It is on this account that Job is so often reproached by his friends for equalling the wicked (רְשָׁעִים) by disputing the

Digitized by Google

Divine retribution. If on this account those who suffer are first of all required to seek for the reason of their sufferings in their sins, Lam. iii. 39 sq. (2), the pedagogy of the law, on the other hand, not only arouses an accusing, but produces a good conscience, which the man who walks in God's ways, and is therefore unable to acknowledge that his suffering is the punishment of his sin, is conscious that he may venture to assert; comp. Ps. xvii. 1 sqq., xviii. 21 sqq., Job xxxi., and other passages. Even in the theocratic covenant, God approaches man as a free subject, as a being who has not only obligations, but rights. Hence no self-condemnation, contrary to his own conscience, is demanded. When Job declines such self-condemnation as was pressed upon him, when he says, *e.g.*, xxvii. 5 sq., "I will not let my integrity be taken from me; my righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go; my heart does not reproach one of my days," his words testify that his conviction of sin was not as yet as deep as it should be. But still his very sincerity in not having recourse to falsehood *in majorem Dei gloriam* is expressly approved, xlii. 7. Severely as the Old Testament rebukes murmuring *unbelief*, and little as it concedes to man, regarded in his natural worthlessness, any claim upon God (3), it still furnishes within the institution of the covenant ground upon which suffering innocence and piety may, when the wicked prosper, venture to expostulate with God, such expostulation being indeed the result of faith in the covenant God and in the truth of His promises. Accordingly, in times of conflict and distress, we find in the Old Testament the language of *expostulation* with the just God in the mouth of His servants, and so often meet with that frequently recurring *why?* "Why standest Thou afar off, O Lord? why hidest Thou Thyself in times of trouble?" Ps. x. 1. "Why does the wicked contemn God?" ver. 13. "How long wilt Thou look on?" xxxv. 17. Comp. also the complaint of the influence of the wicked in the Psalms in general, Ps. xii., xiv., and others. Similar complaints of the supremacy of evil and the delay of Divine retribution are found

Digitized by Google

also in the prophets, comp. Hab. i., Jer. xii. 15, 18, etc. But while the perplexities caused by the fates of nations were solved for the prophets by the view afforded them of the consummation of the Divine kingdom, of the day of the Lord when judgment and deliverance should manifest the Divine righteousness, it was concerning the enigmas of individual life, presented by the prosperity of the wicked and the calamities of the godly, that the reflecting mind of the Old Testament sages struggled to obtain light. Certain of the psalms already dwell on this matter, which is the special subject of the whole Book of Job. The consideration, however, of the contradiction so often existing between the moral worth of a man and his lot in life, leads forthwith to the discovery of another enigma. If there were a retribution after death, a solution of the contradiction in which the lot of man often appears to stand to the justice of God, might be expected in *another world*. But are not all, as we have seen in Part I., equal in death and in the regions of the dead? And then, too, how does the sad doom of Sheol agree with the Divine destination of man? (4). Suppose even that a just man were to prosper during his whole life, what would this profit him, when he descends to the realm of shades? The touching lament over the perishableness of man, over death and the grave, found in many of the psalms, and in ch. vii. and xiv. of the Book of Job, have quite a different meaning from those met with in heathen writers, because the Old Testament did not view the mortality of man as a natural necessity, but connected it with sin and the wrath of God, Ps. xc. 7–9 (see Pt. I. § 77), and because the communion instituted by revelation between the living God and man imparts to human personality an eternal importance. This, indeed, at first only manifests itself in the assurance of the continued duration of the chosen race, but, in proportion as personal experience of communion with God deepens, awakens in the individual also the feeling of an imperishable destiny. Hence, in place of that satisfaction with which we see the

Digitized by Google

patriarchs depart from a life filled with God's goodness, and gathered to their fathers in the joyful prospect of the blessings promised to their descendants, in place of the praise of that mercy of God which had bestowed so much the larger a share of its favours during the fleeting life of man, Ps. ciii. 15–18, we find in hours of temptation, dismay at the fact that communion with God (the seeing of the Lord, Isa. xxxviii. 11) must cease in death. Nay, it seems incomprehensible that God, who desires to be loved and praised by His people, should Himself dissolve the tie which He has made with man; comp. Ps. xxx. 9, lxxxviii. 12 sq., and other passages (5). This fear of death among the Old Testament saints is an infinitely more exalted feeling than the contempt of death found among the heathen; for death, as Luther says in his exposition of Ps. xc., is not to be conquered by contempt, as serfs and rogues suppose.

(1) Comp. my article, *Immortality a Doctrine of the Old Testament*, in Herzog's *Realencyklop.* xxi. p. 419 sqq.

(2) Lam. iii. 39 sq.: "Wherefore doth a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins? Let us search and try our ways, and turn again unto the Lord."

(3) For how should the clay strive with the potter, a potsherd among potsherds! Isa. xxix. 16, xlv. 9–11, and elsewhere.

(4) That the ancient doctrine of Sheol is found also in the Psalms and in the monuments of the Khochmah, has been shown, § 78 sq.

(5) Ps. xxx. 9: "What profit is there in my blood, when I go down to the pit? Shall the dust praise Thee? or shall it declare Thy truth?" *Ib.* lxxxviii. 11 sq.: "Shall Thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave? or Thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall Thy wonders be known in the dark? and Thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" Comp. vi. 6.

Digitized by Google

§ 246.

The Struggle to solve the Enigmas relating to this Subject in the Psalms.

In those psalms which relate to the *contradiction existing between the moral worth of an individual and his external circumstances*, we generally find that the knot is not untied, but simply cut through. The righteous man who seems about to perish must nevertheless be delivered, or Jehovah would not be Jehovah; therefore "for His name's sake" the wicked who thinks himself so secure must perish, as surely as a righteous God exists. When prevailing with God in prayer, the Psalmist surmounts every hindrance which opposes the realization of his confidence; comp. the supplicatory Psalms iii., iv., v., vii., ix., and a whole series of similar ones. Another special feature is to be remarked in those psalms in which that judgment upon his enemies which the Psalmist confidently entreats is also in a measure announced—the so-called imprecatory psalms, of which Ps. lix., lxix., and cix. are the strongest. Instead of being shocked at them, we need simply to understand them. And it is easy to perceive that what we find in them is no private feeling of anger venting itself in curses, but that they are the product of zeal for the honour of that God who is attacked in His servants; comp. especially lxix. 10 (1). Such psalms are just the expression of the sentiment, cxxxix. 21 sq.: "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate Thee? and am not I grieved with them that rise up against Thee? I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies." The fact, however, that there is, in the manner and degree in which the assumption of Divine retribution upon the wicked is expressed, a severity which casts the love that would seek and save the lost into the background, must certainly be in general explained by the difference between the standpoints of the law and of the

Digitized by Google

gospel,—a difference pointed out by our Lord to His disciples when rebuking them for manifesting the zeal of Elijah, Luke ix. 55. But another and often-overlooked point must be here considered. The New Testament itself knows of no other final reconciliation of the contradiction introduced into the world by the existence of evil than that which is accomplished by judgment. But the difference between the two Testaments lies in the circumstance that the Old Testament, referring, as far as retribution is concerned, exclusively to this life, does not afford the same scope for the Divine long-suffering as the New does, and must demand an actual and adequate sentence, an infliction of judgment upon the ungodly within the limits of this earthly existence. How, then, if the very postulate of faith seems again and again falsified by experience,—if, as Ps. lxxiii. 13 says, to cleanse the heart and conduct seems in vain, while the prosperity of audacious transgressors appears secure? The solution furnished by certain psalms is not a dogmatic one, *i.e.* no doctrine actually leading beyond the limits of Mosaism is arrived at. It is rather a solution which is *subjective and personal.* The communion with God to which the Psalmist has been admitted asserts itself with such strength, that he not only finds therein his full compensation for the prosperity of the wicked, but, rising for the moment superior to death and Sheol, knows himself to be inseparably united to God. The transition to such passages is already formed by Ps. iv. 8, where David, in such hopeless circumstances as made many of his followers despair, esteems the joy which he has in God beyond the superfluity in which his enemies revel. But the first chief passage in which the feeling of saving and indissoluble union with God is poured forth is Ps. xvi. Because the Lord is his supreme good, and always with him, the Psalmist is also able to say, ver. 10 sq.: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, nor suffer Thy holy one to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life. In Thy presence is fulness of joy; and at Thy right hand pleasures

Digitized by Google

for evermore." It would (as even Hupfeld frankly admits) empty these words of their meaning to see in them only a confidence of deliverance from mortal peril. To this feeling, however, we must certainly refer such passages as xlviii. 15 and lxviii. 21, which some (*e.g.* Stier) have also interpreted of deliverance from death in a New Testament sense (2). The case of Ps. xvi. is rather as follows: The idea that the righteous must at last succumb to death and Sheol, and that his happiness in God is to be thereby terminated, is at such moments an impossible one to the Psalmist. Hence he gives utterance to a presentiment which reaches beyond the limits of the ancient covenant. The words, "I shall behold Thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with Thy likeness," xvii. 15, if they refer, according to the view still defended by many moderns (De Wette, Delitzsch), to an awakening from the sleep of death, whether to a heavenly life or to resurrection, would lead still further. The meaning of the passage is (3), however, only that the Psalmist is exalting that higher happiness which he, as a godly man, enjoys in beholding God, and on which is founded his assurance that his prayer will be heard, in comparison with that contemptuously described prosperity with which God fills the ungodly (4). The beholding God's face and being satisfied with His likeness do not go beyond the expressions used lxiii. 3, and are just the strongest terms for denoting the consciousness of God's gracious presence. The passage is akin to Ps. iv. 8 sq.; and a comparison with the latter leads to the supposition that Ps. xvii. may be an evening or night prayer, and that the awaking in ver. 15 may refer to awaking from natural sleep. But even if the passage does not treat of a happy life after death, it is still, as Hupfeld justly remarks, an important one, on account of its wonderfully profound conception of the world, and of life in the world as a vain and empty possession, as contrasted with the life of the soul in God. Ps. xlix. 15 and lxxiii. 23 sqq. (5), however, go still further. When the Psalmist says in the former pas-

Digitized by Google

sage, "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave, for He shall receive me" (6), we may indeed, if we disregard the connection, understand him to speak only of deliverance from danger. But it must be observed that these words are spoken in opposition to ver. 8 sqq., according to which no man is capable of redeeming the soul of his neighbour from Sheol, while the Psalmist looks for redemption from God; and to ver. 14, which consigns the man of the world to the desolation of the grave (7). Besides, the allusion of יִקָּחֵנִי to the passage concerning Enoch, Gen. v. 24, וַיִּלָּקַח אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים, is unmistakeable. Thus the Psalmist is evidently expressing the hope that there will be for him an elevation from the region of the dead to a higher life. To return to Ps. lxxiii., it may be disputed whether the words, "Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterwards receive me to glory," ver. 24, have regard to a fulfilment in this or in another world. But in any case, ver. 26, "When my flesh and my heart fail, God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever," expresses the confidence of the Psalmist that even if his heart fails in death, his communion with God cannot be dissolved (8). Still, even in these passages we have (as Delitzsch aptly reminds us) no direct word from God for this hope to lean on; they do but express the postulate of faith, that for the just, existence must issue in glory and in the permanent possession of communion with God. How this is to be realized cannot, however, be shown. Hence the triumph of faith over death and the grave is accompanied by the complaint, so strongly and incisively expressed in Ps. lxxxviii., in answer to which the seals of death and Sheol remain as yet unbroken (9). Let us now see what answer is furnished to the enigmas of life by the Book of Job.

(1) Ps. lxix. 9: "The zeal of Thine house hath eaten me up, and the reproaches of them that reproached Thee are fallen upon me."

Digitized by Google

(2) In saying which, we leave it undecided whether the explanation, "He will be our guide in death, or to death," rests upon the more correct reading of the text.

(3) Still we are not justified in completing the thought (as Delitzsch does): "If I should go to rest in present fear of death." The urgent supplication, ver. 13, that God would arise to help the suppliant against his ungodly foes, is not recalled.

(4) Ver. 14, as I have, after Hengstenberg's example, explained it in the *Commentationes ad theol. bibl.*, does not contain an argument for the supplication in ver. 13, as though the Psalmist were complaining to God of the contradiction between the prosperity and deserts of the wicked.

(5) Comp. Klostermann, *Untersuchungen zur alttest. Theol.* 1868.

(6) יְקַחֵנִי refers to God, not to שְׁאוֹל, which is feminine (§ 78, with note 8).

(7) It is quite arbitrary to complete ver. 15: So far as not to suffer it to go down to the grave prematurely or by violence (so Hengstenberg, in the last article on the Psalms, p. 319).

(8) The thought is arbitrarily deprived of its meaning by Hengstenberg, when he supplies after ver. 26: Through God's mercy it will not, however, come to this.

(9) To the question, Does the announcement of the resurrection of the dead made by the prophets find an echo in the Psalms? I feel obliged to return a negative answer. It is no longer disputed that xc. 3, "Return, ye children of men," does not refer to it; nor am I able to adduce in support of it cxli. 7, "Our bones are scattered at the grave's mouth, as when one ploweth and divideth the earth." Even if the image of ploughing and scattering seed is explained by the object to which both contribute, still the connection leads only to the thought that the persecution and ill-usage endured must result in the triumph of the Psalmist's cause. Much rather might Ps. xxii. 29 be brought forward. יוֹרְדֵי עָפָר, considered in itself, may well be regarded as designating the dead; and the more so that the connection of the feast described ver. 26 with that at which death is to be swallowed up in victory, Isa. xxv. 6–8, is sufficiently probable (comp. § 233). But then the expression חַיִּים would be no fitting contrast; and we should have expected "all the living" or some such expression. On the relation of the

Digitized by Google

Psalms to the last things, compare also Delitzsch's Commentary, i. sec. 2, p. 420 sqq.

§ 247.

Solution of the Enigmas in the Book of Job (1).

All the enigmas with which Israelite wisdom was occupied are discussed in the Book of Job, and every solution produced upon Old Testament soil attempted. This book does not, however, as it has so often been misunderstood from a partial and theoretical point of view, carry on the investigation in the form of a learned debate. On the contrary, a fragment of Old Testament life is at the same time brought before us, and it is shown, by Job's example, how a righteous man may fall into so grievous temptation as to threaten his trust in God with shipwreck, and how the struggles of faith at last result in victory. This book has often been contrasted with Mosaism, as coming to a formal rupture with the doctrine of retribution. This is, however, far from being the case,—the Mosaic doctrine of retribution being, on the contrary, expressly confirmed by the issue, viz. the abundant compensation of the hero of the book for his sufferings. The fact, however, that various Divine purposes are shown to be the reason of human suffering, points out the insufficiency of the opinion that every infliction is to be referred to a corresponding sin, and manifests the right of every responsible being not to be judged absolutely according to outward appearances. It also inculcates the duty of abstaining from hasty decisions concerning obscure providences, and waiting with humility to see their end. This book teaches us to recognise *a fourfold purpose in human suffering*. 1. There is a *penal suffering* with which God visits the ungodly. This proposition is discussed in manifold aspects by the *three friends of Job* (see especially ch. viii., xv. 20–35, ch. xviii. and xx.), and at last conceded by Job himself (xxvii. 11 sqq.), after

Digitized by Google

again maintaining (ch. xxi.) the impunity of transgressors in this world, and admitting in ch. xxiv. the occurrence of penal retribution only with respect to ordinary offenders, but denying the prevalence of God's penal justice in the case of great criminals (2). 2. There is a *Divine chastisement* imposed upon all men, which is necessarily due to the natural impurity and sinfulness of human nature, and must accordingly be borne by the righteous also. The latter submit patiently to the infliction of such chastisement, and may therefore experience a restoration of their prosperity. This is the doctrine which Eliphaz adduces in his first speech, in explanation of the calamities of Job, ch. iv. sq., where, iv. 12–16, he refers to a revelation imparted to him in a night vision. 3. There is also a special *testing and purifying* of the righteous imposed upon them by the love of God, for the purpose of delivering them from some secret pride, of leading them to humble and penitent self-knowledge, and thus ensuring to them the Divine favour. This is the doctrine which Elihu brings forward in xxxiii. 14–29, xxxvi. 5–15. It is closely connected with the solution furnished in ch. iv. by Eliphaz, but yet differs from it, inasmuch as the point of view which the latter insists on is a judicial one, viz. that of a penal discipline which must fall upon the evil and the just alike on account of their inherent sinfulness, and quite irrespective of special sins, and which has in the case of both a different result only by reason of their different behaviour under Divine chastisement. The suffering of which Elihu speaks, on the contrary, concerns only the righteous, and is a proof of the saving love of God, to purify them from that pride of the inner man which threatens to become dangerous (3). And, finally, 4. There is a suffering which is designed to manifest the triumph of faith and the fidelity of the righteous. This it is which was the immediate object of Job's afflictions, as already alluded to in the *prologue* (ch. i. sq.), and evidenced to all in the *epilogue*. Proof is furnished in the case of Job, in opposition to those suspicions on the part of Satan, of which

Digitized by Google

his three friends also rendered themselves guilty by the increasing temper with which they spoke, that the faith of even a true servant of God may be sorely shaken, nay, that he may be brought to the very verge of despair, by the temptation of suffering; that nevertheless he cannot, even in the midst of rebellion against God, entirely give Him up; and, finally, that his fidelity stands the test, though he does not come through the trial without abundant cause for humiliation. Such sufferings are akin to those endured as *testimony*, to sufferings entailed by confession of the truth, and zeal for the house of God, as spoken of in many of the psalms (*e.g.* Ps. xxii., § 233), and by Jeremiah.

But while the Book of Job thus offers a key to these afflictions of the righteous, it at the same time furnishes reasons for believing in the righteous providence of God, from the consideration of His character and His dominion over nature. From the character of God—in the profound speech of Elihu, ch. xxxiv. 10 sqq., the fundamental thought of which is: God, by reason of His *power* over the world, can never be unjust. For the world is not a thing alien to Him, a thing entrusted to Him by another, but His own possession, and all life therein is derived from His breath. God cannot be unjust to that which He Himself called into existence, and maintains therein. It is just because He is the Creator and Governor of the world that He is also the only source of right therein. He so directs the lot of individuals and nations, that right is at last made manifest. This oneness of power and righteousness in God is also brought forward in the second address of the Lord to Job, ch. xl., and the subject applied to man, to show that, if his righteousness is to be vindicated at the expense of the Divine righteousness, he ought also to be possessed of Divine power. But Divine providence also may be inferred from God's dominion over nature. This proposition is already prepared for in ch. xxviii., the idea being there carried out (4) that man, though incapable of becoming possessed of the Divine wisdom itself, of the thought

Digitized by Google

according to which the world is ordered, is yet able to recognise its traces in the whole economy of nature, and may therefore, with regard to the Divine appointment of human life, resign himself to, and fall back on, the fear of God. This point of view is, however, especially maintained by Elihu. God approaches man in nature as an incomparable teacher (מִי כָמֹהוּ מוֹרֶה, xxxvi. 22), everywhere manifesting to him His wisdom and power. And if, on the other hand, the course of nature brings before him so many paradoxes, so much that is incomprehensible, this furnishes him with a standard whereby to judge that which is incomprehensible in human life, as expressed in the fine passage xxxvii. 21 sqq. (5). The meaning of this passage is: As when the light of the sun is hidden from the sight of man by a cloud, the sun is nevertheless shining in the atmosphere, and presently again unveils itself to the eye, so God, though His interposition is often concealed from us, is surrounded by pure light; and as the dark north bears gold in its bosom, so also is there pure light behind the obscurity of God's dispensations. Thus Elihu shows that man is not obliged to resign himself to such a conclusion as Job had done in ch. xxviii., but may, from perceiving that there is a purpose in the Divine dealings, at least attain to so much knowledge, that instead of arrogantly censuring providence, he may confidently look for a solution of its enigmas.

(1) From internal evidence, it is probable that the Book of Job must not be referred, as by many, to the times of Solomon, but to one of the subsequent centuries of Israel's adversity and affliction. We see from Jeremiah and Ezekiel that it was just in such troublous national times that men's minds were exercised by the doctrine of retribution. And though it was only the inconsiderate among the people who so misapplied the saying of the law, that God visits the sins of the fathers upon the children, as to represent themselves as suffering present evils without their own fault (an error reproved Jer. xxxi. 29 sq., Ezek. xviii., comp. § 75), still we see from Jer. xii. 1 sqq. how sorely even the faith of a prophet was

Digitized by Google

tried. For a survey of the train of thought in this book, see the Programme cited, p. 19 sqq. Compare also my review of Hahn's and Schlottmann's *Commentaries on the Book of Job* in *Reuter's Repertorium*, 1852.

(2) Stickel (*Das Buch Hiob*, etc., 1842, p. 186 sqq.) was the first to point out the correct meaning of this difficult section.

(3) Hence, but for the speeches of Elihu, an essential aspect of the Divine purpose in sending affliction would not have been treated of at all in this book,—a circumstance which might indeed have given a subsequent writer occasion for interpolating this portion. Nor must it be by any means overlooked, that without these speeches there would be no due acknowledgment that the three friends of Job were so far in the right when they asserted that affliction *always* has a reference to the sinfulness of man. In the place which these addresses now occupy in the book, they serve at the same time to prepare for that humble submission of Job which was to be brought about by the appearance of the Almighty. See the conclusion of the section.

(4) See above, in the description of objective Divine wisdom, § 237.

(5) Job xxxvii. 21 sqq. (a storm is supposed to be approaching): "Now we see not the sunshine which nevertheless glitters in the cloud; then the wind passeth over it, and cleanseth it. From the north cometh gold: the glory about God is terrible. We cannot find the Almighty, who is excellent in power; in judgment and in fulness of justice He does not afflict. Therefore men fear Him: He respecteth not the wise of heart."

§ 248.

Continuation.

The question which still remains to be discussed is, What position does the Book of Job, which keeps the attention directed to the state of man after death, beyond any book of the Old Testament, occupy with regard to the *doctrine of immortality?* The notion that its direct purpose is to prove the

Digitized by Google

doctrine of the immortality of the human soul, rests upon a misconception. It is, however, true that in it are deposited the presuppositions of the hope of eternal life. For it brings forward, in passages already mentioned, the painful contradiction existing between man's destiny to communion with God and that descent to Sheol which awaits him, and at the same time testifies that the mind, in its struggle with this contradiction, cannot avoid attaining to a glimpse of its solution. A remarkable progress is in this respect manifested in this book. For though in vii. 7 sqq., x. 20–22, the lamentations over the transitoriness of man and the abode in Sheol, the region of night, whence there is no return, sound quite hopeless, the hope is already expressed, in ch. xiv., that the sojourn in Sheol may be but a transient one, and that the time may come when God, having a desire towards the work of His hands, shall turn again to man. It is said, ver. 14, "If a man dies, shall he live? All the days of my campaign will I wait, till my discharge come;" and, ver. 15, "Thou shalt call, and I will answer Thee: Thou wilt have a desire to the work of Thy hands." And the anticipation prepared for by xvi. 18 sqq. reaches its climax in the passage xix. 25–27, where Job, no longer expecting a justification of his innocence during the short respite still allotted him, expresses, on the other hand, his confidence that God will arise even over his grave as his Goel, his avenger of blood, to retrieve his honour before the world, by inflicting judgments upon those who had suspected him, and that he shall behold this Divine interposition. Notwithstanding the multitude of erroneous explanations which have been offered, the only view which can be accepted as doing justice to the words, is that which regards the passage as expressing the hope of a manifestation of God to be made in Job's favour after his death. It may perhaps be disputed whether Job's beholding God as his Redeemer (Goel) is to take place in another world. For certainly the view, advocated especially by H. Schultz (1), that Job was only transposing himself to the period after his death,—that he was

Digitized by Google

now seeing with the eye of the mind how God would then appear as his witness and procure his acquittal,—must not be regarded as absolutely impossible. The imperfect יחזה is, however, utterly unfavourable to this explanation. Still the passage, even according to the explanation which we have adopted, speaks only of a momentary beholding, which, however, presupposes a continuance of Job's communion with God after death. But the hope which here flashes for a moment like lightning through the darkness of temptation, is as yet no mature faith in a happy and eternal life after death, and consequently does not furnish a solution to the enigmas with which the book is occupied. This presentiment of Job appears only as a last resort, if the solution should remain undiscovered in this world. In the course of the poem, it is evident that this glimpse of hope on the part of Job has the effect of enabling him to maintain greater composure; but in the end the solution is brought to pass in a manner which confirms the Old Testament doctrine of retribution, and keeps the book within Old Testament limits. That final solution of all enigmas, that the sufferings of this present world are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in the children of God, was not discovered by Job, nor by the Old Testament in general. By reason of the constant connection existing between revealed knowledge and the facts of revelation, a belief in eternal life which should be truly stable could not arise until the acquisition of eternal life, as faith in Him who in His own person overcame death and brought life and immortality to light, and who through His redeeming work has perfected also the saints of the Old Testament, Heb. xi. 40.

(1) See H. Schultz, *Die Voraussetzungen der christl. Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit*, p. 222, and *Alttest. Theol.* ii. p. 169 sq.

Digitized by Google

FIFTH SECTION.

RENUNCIATION OF THE SOLUTION IN THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES.

§ 249.

Standpoint of this Book. Inquiry concerning Divine Retribution and Immortality.

The Book of Ecclesiastes, whose composition is probably to be referred to the second half of the fifth (comp. § 191), or at latest to the fourth century B.C., forms the conclusion of the canonical Old Testament Khochmah. Its standpoint may be briefly designated as that of a *renunciation of comprehending that Divine government of the world*, the reality of which to *faith*, it, however, firmly embraces. The proposition with which the book opens, "Vanity of vanities; . . . all is vanity," is not to be taken in an objective sense, as though the world were but the region of chance, which the author expressly denies, but in the subjective meaning that for man, notwithstanding all his efforts after knowledge, and all his activity, the course of this world yields nothing real or permanent; on which account it is immediately added, i. 3, "What profit (מַה־יִּתְרוֹן) hath a man of all his labour which he taketh under the sun?" The latter sentence is not intended to state a problem which is about to be solved in the book,—the question as to what is the supreme good being thus regarded as the theme of the work,—for the author has done with the notion that any יִתְרוֹן, any result, is to be expected. The words are rather an exclamation in a negative sense, expressing the resultlessness of all human efforts. This is accordingly proved, the author speaking in the person of the ancient king Solomon, the wise and glorious

Digitized by Google

monarch, who had enjoyed in rich abundance all that this world can offer, had obtained whatever man can obtain, and now at the close of his life testified that in all this he had found no real satisfaction, no true happiness. Even the wisdom of which he possessed a larger measure than other mortals, had only the effect of convincing him that real good is not to be found by man in aught earthly. This negation, however, of all finite objects does not advance to the perception of a positive and eternal object. On the contrary, absolute good being hidden from man, nothing is left for him but to accept with resignation the relative good which consists in using this fleeting life as well as possible, by being obedient to the Divine commands and mindful of the approaching Divine judgment, while at the same time committing all to God (1). This book is equally misunderstood when its author is credited with a knowledge surpassing Old Testament limits, and especially with the knowledge of eternal life, etc., and when he is regarded as a fatalist or an Epicurean. So little does this book preach infidelity, that its author does not surrender even one of the doctrines transmitted to him. That there is a Divine government of the world, that there is a righteous retribution, faith may not question: it is the *how* of these matters that man is unable to comprehend. God, it is said, iii. 11, hath made everything beautiful in its time; He hath also set eternity in the heart of man. For we are not justified in giving here to עֹלָם another than its usual meaning, which it retains also in ver. 14. The expression refers back to the reflections, ii. 12 sqq. (2). Man, the author would say, cannot cease to seek that which is eternal and imperishable; "but man cannot find out the work that God doeth from beginning to end," *i.e.* is never able to understand the result produced by the God-ordained course of the world (3). This appears especially in respect *of Divine retribution.* Experience is seen by the author to be always at variance with the adoption of this doctrine. If the Book of Proverbs categorically lays down (as we have seen, sec. 3, §

Digitized by Google

243) the proposition, "Wisdom brings life; folly death; the memory of the just is blessed; but the name of the wicked shall rot," Ecclesiastes points out, ii. 14, that "wisdom excelleth folly, inasmuch as the wise man's eyes are in his head; but the fool walketh in darkness. But one event happeneth to all: as it happeneth to the fool, so it happeneth even to me. There is no more remembrance for ever of the wise man than of the fool; seeing that which now is, in the days to come shall all be forgotten, and how the wise man dieth as the fool." To this is added the sad experience of the impunity of the wicked. Still all this must not destroy the postulate of faith, viii. 12 sq.: "Though the sinner do evil a hundred times, and his days be prolonged, yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God, that fear before Him. But it shall not be well with the wicked, neither shall he prolong his days," etc.; comp. also the similar passage, iii. 16 sq.

When this contrast between *faith*, which confidently assumes the existence of a solution to the contradictions found in the world, and *natural knowledge*, which proves itself insufficient in all cases, and cannot furnish a solution to any of the enigmas, —when this contrast, which pervades the whole book, is considered, the discrepancies supposed to exist therein disappear, and the attempt to reconcile them, by forcibly adapting one passage to another, may be given up, and its due weight and meaning allowed to each. It is from this point of view that the question whether Ecclesiastes teaches the immortality of man must be answered. Various answers may be given, just because three different standpoints are taken up in the book with respect to it (4),—that, 1*st*, of *natural reflection*; 2*d*, of *the old doctrine of Sheol*; 3*d*, of *the assumption of a future retribution*. From the standpoint of natural observation, *e.g.*, it is said, iii. 19, that the fate of man and the animals appears to be the same in death; for "who knows," it is asked, ver. 21, "whether the spirit of man goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth?" That natural observa-

Digitized by Google

tion can give man no information in this respect, should serve to humble him, ver. 18. God would prove them, that they may see that in themselves (*i.e.* apart from their relation to God) they are beasts. The old doctrine of Sheol is (5), on the other hand, expressed in ix. 4–6, 10,—passages which have been already discussed, Pt. I. § 78 sq. The third standpoint is asserted at the close, where the author, repelling all the doubts resulting from natural observation, positively expresses, xii. 7, the tenet that the spirit of man returns to God who gave it; and, xii. 14, comp. xi. 9, that God will bring every secret thing to judgment, whether it be good or whether it be evil. How the author conceived of the relation between the spirit that returns to God and the shade that departs to the region of the dead, cannot indeed be determined. Neither can the controversy, in what sense he teaches a future judgment, be decided. It is not probable that he transferred it to some earthly events to be developed in this life, the expression "every secret thing" seeming opposed to such a notion; but nothing certain can be stated on this subject.

(1) But herein consists the advance made in this book beyond the Book of Job, which at its close falls back upon the Old Testament standpoint.

(2) In Eccles. ii. 12 sqq., what is spoken of is, that the satisfaction which man obtains from his efforts and labour is destroyed as soon as he reflects that he thereby obtains no permanent result to outlast his transitory existence.

(3) Many expositors, on the other hand, give to עוֹלָם the later signification *world*, which it had not yet acquired in the Old Testament, and which affords no good contrast.

(4) Entirely opposite views have been taken in this respect, the Preacher being said by some to entirely deny continuance after death, and by others to teach the immortality of the soul and a future judgment.

(5) It might seem most natural to think of a judgment following the abode in Sheol, where, according to ix. 5, there is no reward. But however the passage may be understood,

Digitized by Google

positive testimony of the life eternal is not found in this book. Comp. also my *Comment. Bibl. Theol.* p. 83 sqq.

§ 250.

Moral Teaching of the Book. Conclusion.

The *moral teaching* imparted in this book corresponds with that standpoint of resignation which it occupies. If an inexorable demand is made that man should submit to the Divine will, and if at the same time the supreme aim of his life according to that will cannot be ascertained by him, while, on the other hand, various aims are set before him, all of which he cannot but regard as in their measure lawful, his moral life must be spent in a constant balancing between different and intersecting claims. Hence prudence, moderation in all things, the *μηδὲν ἄγαν*, is the quality to be most urgently recommended. The self-confidence reposing on conscious virtue is blamed, as well as pride in knowledge. To this refers the injunction, vii. 16, "Be not righteous over-much, neither make thyself over-wise," which is followed, ver. 17, by, "Be not over-much wicked, neither be thou foolish," the meaning of which is: Do not think thou canst be free from sin (see ver. 20); but that thine inclination to sin may not get the better of thee, thou must moderate it. Ver. 18: "It is good that thou shouldest take hold of the one, and also not withdraw thy hand from the other; for he that *feareth God* shall come forth from them all." Thus the happy medium lies between a self-righteousness over-zealous for virtue and a sinful levity of life; and this happy medium is inculcated by the fear of God, with which (comp. iii. 12 sq.) is combined also a reasonable proportion of the enjoyments of this life; for it is said, iii. 13, "That every man should eat and drink, and enjoy the good of all his labour, is the gift of God." But the gladness which imparts vigour to the inner life is not found in the Preacher.

Digitized by Google

Placed in the midst of vicissitudes ordained of God (ver. 1 sqq.), he takes patiently whatever comes as from Him, vii. 14: "In the day of prosperity be joyful, and in the day of adversity consider: God hath made the one as well as the other, that man may find nothing after him," *i.e.* may not fathom what lies behind his present condition. In such patient composure the wise man does at all times just that which is seasonable, and commits the issue to God. Thus are to be explained the sayings, xi. 4 sqq.: "He that observeth the wind shall not sow, and he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap;" *i.e.*, he for whom the weather is never fine enough, and who is therefore always waiting for better, generally misses the right time; ver. 6: "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand; for thou knowest not which shall prosper, whether this or that, or whether both shall be alike good;" *i.e.*, be always assiduous in thy calling: fulfil each hour that which is incumbent on thee, without care as to the result; for thou knowest not whether the labour of this or of that hour shall prosper. The frame of mind possessed by the wise man in the midst of all this composure is shown vii. 2–4: "It is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of feasting, for that (to be mourned) is the end of all men; and let the living lay it to heart. Sorrow is better than laughter; for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better. The heart of the wise is in the house of mourning; but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth." Ecclesiastes may be called a book of worldly sadness,—not the sadness of one utterly sick of life, but of one who, though weary, does not suffer the stimulus of eternity to be plucked out of his heart, and who has rescued his fear of God out of the ruins of his earthly hopes and schemes. Hence at its close, xi. 9 sqq., the Preacher exhorts the young man to enjoy the pleasures of youth, which vanishes like the dawn, because when old age with its infirmity sets in, no more pleasure can be attained in this life; but while re-

Digitized by Google

joicing in youth, to remember the Creator from whom all good things come, and never to surrender the certainty "that for all these things God will bring him into judgment." The dialectics of the Book of Ecclesiastes, with their mainly negative result, also form a transition *from the Old to the New Testament.* For from a persuasion of the vanity of all earthly good, arises the longing after the eternal and saving blessings of the New Testament, and the desire for the coming of that immutable kingdom of God announced by prophecy, in which the inquiries of Old Testament and all other wisdom have found their enduring object (1).

(1) It lies beyond the limits of the task we have imposed upon ourselves (see § 4) to show how Hebrew wisdom, after exhausting itself in the way hitherto described, sought to satisfy its struggles after knowledge by combining Hellenic with Oriental elements (comp. the article *Pädagogik des A. T.* in Schmid, v. p. 692 sqq., and *Buch der Weisheit und judischer Hellenismus*, x. p. 298 sqq. For particulars respecting the view of the state after death in the Apocrypha, see the article *Unsterblichkeit Lehre des A. T.* in Herzog, xxi. p. 424 sqq., and comp. H. Schultz, *Die Voraussetzungen der christl. Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit*, p. 239 sqq.).

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS.

Aaron, race of, i. 293, 304.
Abiathar, ii. 162.
Abijah, ii. 210.
Abimelech, ii. 137.
Abram, Abraham, i. 87–92, 242, 263, 337.
Achan, i. 119, 120.
Achelis, i. 159, 257.
Adultery, i. 339 sq., 341.
After-Passover, ii. 72.
Ages of the world, i. 71.
Ahab, king, ii. 189 sq.; the false prophet, ii. 240.
Ahaz, ii. 219 sq.
Ahaziah of Israel, ii. 191; of Judah, ii. 213.
Ahijah, ii. 180, 187.
Alexandrian theology, i. 31.
Almond blossoms, i. 382.
Altar, i. 380.
Amaziah, ii. 214.
Ammonites, i. 261; ii. 398.
Amon, ii. 227.
Amos, ii. 187, 198 sq., 218, 314, 332, 375, 414.
Analogia fidei, i. 38, 41.
Angelology, Mosaic, i. 196; prophetic, ii. 276 sqq., 281 sq.
Angels, names of, ii. 284 sq., 287.
Anointing of the high priest, i. 314; of kings, ii. 151; of prophets, ii. 193.
Anthropology of Mosaism, ii. 210 sqq.
Anthropomorphisms, i. 145, 162.
Anthropopathies, i. 167.
Apocalypse, Jewish, ii. 266.
Apocrypha, i. 17.
Archæology, i. 14.
Artaxerxes Longimanus, ii. 256.
Asa, ii. 210.
Assyria, ii. 200, 219 sqq., 226, 405.
Athaliah, ii. 212.
Athenagoras, ii. 320.
Atonement, the day of, designation of, ii. 43; date of, ii. 43; rites of, ii. 45 sqq.; signification of, ii. 54 sq.; antiquity of, ii. 54.
Atoning sacrifice, i. 393; ii. 28.
Auberlen, i. 64.
Augustine, i. 35, 268, 338; ii. 321, 322.
Authorities, theocratic: legislative, i. 318; judicial, i. 320; executive, i. 328.
Authorship, prophetic, ii. 216 sq.
Azariah, the prophet, ii. 210 sq.; the king, ii. 214.

Baal-Berith, ii. 134.
Baasha, ii. 187.
Babel, i. 81.
Babylon, ii. 369, 374.
Bähr, i. 369, 409, 422; ii. 80.
Baier, i. 46.
Balaam, i. 112; ii. 337, 408.
Baruch, ii. 210.
Bauer, Bruno, i. 52, 280, 282; ii. 315, 330.
Bauer, Lor., i. 50, 52.
Baumgarten-Crusius, i. 50.
Baur, F. C., i. 51; ii. 81, 111.
Baur, G., i. 85, 229, 241.
Beck, T. T., i. 210; ii. 343.
Bengel, J. A., i. 46, 47, 157, 159; ii. 354, 416.
Benjamin, tribe of, ii. 182.
Berosus, i. 90; ii. 236.
Bertheau, i. 271; ii. 136, 237, 255, 259 sq., 361.
Bethel, ii. 185, 192.
Bless themselves, they shall, i. 89.
Blessing, parental, i. 95, 97; Divine, i. 284.
Blood, avenging of, i. 349 sqq.
Blood, the, i. 221, 392, 413; ii. 37, 47.
Body, i. 216.
Böttcher, i. 220, 251; ii. 396.
Brotherhood, original, of mankind, i. 81, 215.
Bruch, Fr., ii. 177, 433.
Buddeus, i. 46.
Burk, i. 46; ii. 437.
Burnt-offering, i. 410, 424 sq.
Burnt-offering, altar of, i. 376, 380.
Buttmann, i. 51.

Digitized by Google

Caiaphas, ii. 317, 337.
Calixtus, i. 42.
Calvin, i. 38, 41, 240, 274; ii. 415.
Canaanites, hardening of, i. 178, 240; extermination of, i. 119; incomplete, ii. 125; serfdom of, i. 363.
Candlestick in the sanctuary, i. 381.
Canon, i. 16 sqq.
Capital punishment, i. 325 sq.
Captivity, Assyrian, ii. 202; Babylonian, ii. 239, 245.
Carchemish, ii. 235.
Caspari, ii. 222, 285, 302, 361, 420.
Cassel, P., i. 94; ii. 126.
Census, i. 113; ii. 156.
Chaldean power, the, ii. 235.
Cherubim, i. 385 sqq.; ii. 170, 172, 174.
Children, the blessing of, i. 214, 285; ii. 458.
Chronicles, ii. 149.
Circumcision, historical origin of, i. 277 sqq.; religious import of, i. 280 sqq.
Civil institutions, ii. 458.
Clericus, i. 47, 369.
Coccejus, i. 43 sq.; ii. 309.
Collegia biblica, i. 45 sq.
v. Cölln, i. 50, 67; ii. 273.
Coming of the Lord, ii. 406.
Condition, psychical, of the organs of revelation, i. 207; ii. 331.
Conscience, i. 222, 230, 265; predictions of, ii. 340.
Countenance, the Divine, i. 185 sq.
Court of the tabernacle, ii. 378.
Courts of the temple, ii. 171.
Covenant, first breach of, i. 108; book of the, i. 117; ark of the, i. 383 sq., ii. 129, 137, 157, 163, 174, 406; sacrifices, i. 392.
Covenant of God with Israel, i. 254 sqq.; new, i. 29, ii. 303, 382.
Covenants of promise, i. 81, 87, 254.
Covering, i. 414 sqq.
Creation, account of the, i. 72; doctrine of, i. 169.
Creuzer, i. 51.
Crusius, C. A., i. 46; ii. 325.
Cup of trembling, ii. 289.
Curse, the Divine, i. 284 sqq.
Cursing, water of, i. 339; ii. 64.
Cuthat, ii. 205.
Cuthites, ii. 204.
Cyrus, ii. 248, 253.

Dan, ii. 131.
Daniel, ii. 249, 296, 328, 333, 336.
Daniel, Book of, ii. 266, 365, 376, 419.
Darius Hystaspis, ii. 253.
Dates, prophetic, ii. 351.
David, anointing of, ii. 154; reign of, ii. 156; theocratic position of, ii. 157 sq.; religious character of, ii. 159; his zeal for Divine worship, ii. 162; promise to, ii. 158, 409.
Day of mourning, ii. 241, 246.
Day of the Lord, ii. 370.
Dead, region of the, i. 247 sqq.; ii. 454, 465.
Death, fear of, ii. 465.
Death the consequence of sin, i. 242.
Deborah, ii. 125 sq., 128, 142.
Decalogue, its division, i. 267; its system, i. 273.
Delitzsch, Fr., i. 64, 146, 195, 210, 220, 224 sqq., 246; ii. 179, 336, 377, 404, 408, 419, 427, 428, 437, 440, 470.
Deliverance, the, from Egypt, i. 101.
Deluge, tradition of the, i. 78.
Dettinger, i. 161, 196.
Deutero-Isaiah, ii. 248.
Deuteronomy, i. 115 sqq., 187, 256, 267, 298, 300 sq., 303; ii. 230, 232.
Devotion, vow of, ii. 14.
De Wette, i. 50, 53 sq., 66 sqq., 288; ii. 132, 326.
Diestel, i. 49, 85 sq., 158, 159, 252; ii. 56.
Dilation, law of, ii. 354.
Discipline, ii. 445, 460, 473.
Dispensation, a new, necessary, ii. 299.
Divination, natural, ii. 341.
Dog, price of a, ii. 16.
Dominion, extent of Israelite, i. 113.
Doves or pigeons, offering of, i. 400.
Dreams, i. 208; ii. 335.
Drink-offering, i. 408.

Eber, i. 96.
Ebrard, i. 143; ii. 354.
Ecclesiastes, its composition, ii. 257, 479; canonicity, ii. 260; standpoint, ii. 479; doctrine of retribution, ii. 480; doctrine of immortality, ii. 482; ethics, ii. 483; transition to the New Testament, ii. 485.
Edomites, i. 112; ii. 243, 376, 401.
Education of children, i. 343; ii. 458, 460.
Eichhorn, ii. 189, 196.
Elah, ii. 187.
Election of Israel, i. 256 sqq., 287 sq.
Eli, ii. 131, 137.
Eliezer, the prophet, ii. 211.
Elihu, ii. 473.
Elijah, i. 253; ii. 190.
Elisha, ii. 191, 198.
Elkanah, ii. 139.
Encampment, order of, i. 109, 111.

Digitized by Google

Enigmas of human life, ii. 463; struggle for their solution in the Psalms, ii. 467; in Job, ii. 472; renunciation of their solution in Ecclesiastes, ii. 479.
Enoch, i. 78, 240, 253.
Ephod, i. 314 sq.; ii. 134.
Esarhaddon, ii. 204 sq.
Esther, ii. 256, 259.
Eternal God, i. 146.
Eudæmonism, apparent, of Old Testament, i. 285; ii. 455.
Evil, i. 75, 177; ii. 459.
Ewald, i. 22, 50, 72, 105 sq., 141, 171, 241, 280, 359, 412, 426; ii. 4, 20, 33, 57, 72, 103, 107, 179, 203, 215, 232, 258, 305, 375, 420, 428, 441, 444, 454.
Exegesis, i. 60 sqq.
Existence of God, i. 23; ii. 435.
Ezekiel, ii. 236, 245, 295, 303, 375.
Ezra, ii. 256 sq., 261 sq., 267 sq.

Faith, i. 223; ii. 305, 481.
Faithfulness of God, i. 139, 163, 165; ii. 379.
Families, laws concerning, i. 345.
Fasting, ii. 14, 43, 246.
Fatherhood of God, i. 258; ii. 300.
Fat-offering, participation of the, ii. 5 sq., 9 sq.
Fear of the Lord, ii. 446.
Festivals, Mosaic, ii. 68 sqq.
Figurative prophecy, ii. 411.
Fire, sacred, the, i. 425.
First-born, both kinds of, i. 295; redemption of, i. 343, ii. 25; rights of, ii. 345; of cattle, ii. 25.
First-fruits, ii. 26.
Flour, offering of, ii. 37, 41.
Foreign elements in the Apocrypha, i. 19.
Four, the number, i. 387.
Fowls, i. 402.
Free cities, ii. 302, 350.
Fundamental articles of Judaism, i. 10.

Gabler, i. 50, 59.
Gad, the prophet, ii. 156, 160.
Gedaliah, ii. 242 sq.
Geffcken, i. 271.
Genius, religious, of Israel, i. 21.
Gerhardt, i. 44.
Gibeonites, ii. 164.
Gideon, ii. 125, 134, 150.
Gilgal, ii. 182.
Girls, names of, i. 284; education of, ii. 462.
Glory of God, i. 159, 186.
God, name of, ii. 270; change of, i. 82, 88, 91.
God, the, of heaven, ii. 281.
God, the idea of, in Mosaism, i. 126; in prophetism, ii. 269.
God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, i. 86, 183.
Gog, ii. 376.
Good, moral, realization of, in individual life, ii. 453; in social circles, ii. 457.
Graf, C. H., i. 19; ii. 294, 420.
Graf, E., ii. 340.
Gramberg, i. 50, 53; ii. 230.
Grau, i. 234.
Gregory the Great, i. 36; ii. 323.
Guilt inherited, i. 137.
Gürtler, N., i. 43.

Habakkuk, ii. 229; Book of, ii. 314.
Haggai, ii. 254, 375.
Hallel, ii. 112.
Hamann, ii. 340.
Hanani, ii. 211.
Hananiah, ii. 240.
Hand, filling the, i. 306, 311.
Hand, laying of the, upon the sacrifice, i. 409; ii. 35, 38.
Hand, the, of God, i. 145; ii. 316.
Hasse, i. 61.
Hävernick, i. 61, 238, 387; ii. 273, 284, 420.
Hazael, ii. 197.
Heart, the, i. 221 sq.; ii. 449.
Heathen nations, relation of, to Israel, i. 261, ii. 363; judgment of, ii. 373; admission of, into the kingdom of God, ii. 398.
Heave-offering, ii. 7.
Heavenly bodies, the, ii. 227, 274.
Hegel, i. 16, 51, 56, 204; ii. 446.
Heiresses, i. 346.
Hengstenberg, i. 61, 64, 89, 91, 385 sq., 419; ii. 2, 56, 88, 109, 133, 135, 189, 204, 284, 287, 326 sqq., 330, 335, 339, 348 sq., 356, 360, 384, 389, 396, 408, 411, 413, 421, 424, 430, 471.
Herder, i. 53; ii. 273.
Herzfeld, ii. 148, 166, 257.
Hesiod, i. 72.
Hess, i. 62.
Hezekiah, ii. 220 sq., 206, 220.
High-priesthood, i. 312; history of, ii. 131, 176; of Messiah, ii. 441.
Hiller, i. 46.
Hinnom, ii. 227, 232.
Historical composition, Old Testament, ii. 145 sq.
Historical and philosophical treatment of religion, i. 51 sqq., 55 sqq.
History, Israelite, i. 11, 14.

Digitized by Google

Hitzig, ii. 106, 236, 294, 397, 399, 404, 415, 430, 433, 462.
Hofmann, J. Chr. K., i. 4, 61; ii. 116, 286, 377, 418, 427, 441.
Hölemann, i. 75.
Holiness of God, i. 154; of Israel, i. 157 sq., 259; of places, i. 157; of seasons, i. 158.
Holy of Holies, i. 384; ii. 170, 172.
Holy things, i. 378 sqq.
Hophra, ii. 238.
Horns of the altar of burnt-offering, i. 376, 380.
Hosea, the prophet, ii. 198, 216, 217, 414.
Hoshea, ii. 202.
Host of heaven, ii. 274 sqq., 276 sqq.
Houses or families, i. 346.
Huldah, ii. 230, 240.
Human sacrifices, i. 91, 397; ii. 136, 227.
Hupfeld, i. 64; ii. 93, 98 sq., 100, 111, 469.
Hyksos, i. 103.

Immanuel, ii. 415.
Immortality, i. 244, 253, 289; ii. 454, 469 sqq., 482.
Impossibility of picturing God, i. 161.
Incense, i. 408.
Inheritance, law of, i. 345 sqq.
Intercession, ii. 425.
Isaac, i. 92.
Isaiah, ii. 202, 208, 216, 220, 328, 414, 419.
Islam, i. 27, 60; ii. 446.
Israel, i. 93.
Israel, tribes of, i. 95 sqq., 291 sqq.; ii. 175, 250.

Jacob, i. 93 sq., 177, 214, 345.
Jahaziel, ii. 211.
Jealousy offering, i. 341; ii. 63.
Jehoahaz, of Israel, ii. 198, 214; of Judah, ii. 234.
Jehoiachin, ii. 236.
Jehoiakim, ii. 234 sq.
Jehonadab, ii. 195.
Jehoram, of Israel, ii. 194; of Judah, ii. 212, 215.
Jehoshaphat, ii. 211; valley of, ii. 374.
Jehovah, the name, i. 183; pronunciation and grammatical explanation of, i. 134 sqq.; import of, i. 139; age and origin of, i. 141; comparison of, with Elohim and El, i. 144.
Jehovah Sabaoth, ii. 270 sqq.
Jehu, the prophet, ii. 211; the king, ii. 195, 197.
Jephthah, ii. 135.
Jeremiah, ii. 209, 217, 231, 234, 238 sqq., 294.
Jeroboam, ii. 185 sq.
Jeroboam II., ii. 198.
Jerome, ii. 147, 321, 361.
Jerubbaal, ii. 136.
Jerusalem, i. 90; ii. 157, 161, 386.
Jews, ii. 182, 183.
Jezebel, ii. 190.
Joash, of Israel, ii. 198; of Judah, ii. 213.
Job, Book of, ii. 291, 463, 472.
Joel, ii. 209, 213, 216, 354, 373.
Jonah, ii. 198; Book of, ii. 359, 367.
Joseph, i. 95, 177 sqq.
Joshua, i. 110, 119, ii. 143; the high priest, ii. 250; Book of, i. 124, ii. 76, 128.
Josiah, ii. 229, 391.
Jotham, ii. 214 sqq.
Jubilee, year of, law of, ii. 94; import of, ii. 103; practicability of the ordinance, ii. 105.
Judah, tribe of, i. 95, 97, 111; kingdom of, ii. 182, 206.
Judges, Book of, ii. 123 sqq., 128 sqq.
Judges, times of the, ii. 123 sqq.
Judgment, prediction of, upon Israel, i. 286, ii. 371; upon the heathen nations, ii. 373.
Jus talionis, i. 284, 339, 350.
Justice, Divine, the, i. 163 sqq.
Justin Martyr, i. 35; ii. 320.

Kaiser, G. Ph. Ch., i. 51.
Kant, i. 50, 53.
Keerl, i. 18.
Keil, ii. 31, 33, 42, 88, 102, 105, 260; ii. 260.
Khochmah, ii. 177, 431.
King, law of the, i. 329; consecration of, ii. 151.
Kings, Book of, ii. 149.
Kingship, ii. 150; in Judah, ii. 206, 209; the Divine, i. 290; the Messianic, ii. 406, 417.
Kleinert, i. 173; ii. 259, 415.
Knobel, i. 281, 422; ii. 9, 12, 42, 404.
Korah, i. 301.
Koran, i. 201.
Kranichfeld, ii. 147, 196.
Kurtz, i. 64, 92, 191, 268, 271, 280, 390, 407 sq., 420; ii. 29, 40, 116.

Land, Holy, its boundaries, i. 113; conquest, i. 119; division, i. 122; character, i. 123; promises concerning, i. 87, 89, ii. 386.
Lardner, 47.
Lasaulx, i. 32; ii. 340 sqq.
Laver in the court, i. 380.

Digitized by Google

Law, the, i. 264; relation between the moral and ceremonial, i. 266, ii. 293; covenant of, i. 106; delight in, ii. 300.
Leaven, ii. 109, 115.
Leprosy, its defilement, ii. 61; purification from, ii. 61 sq.
Leprosy in houses, ii. 61.
Lessing, i. 50, 52.
Levi, i. 96, 109, 237, 294.
Levirate marriage, i. 346.
Levites, cities of the, i. 300, 302; ii. 130, 265.
Levites, the, representation of Israel by, i. 295; official functions of, i. 298 sq.; social position of, i. 300; position of, in the times of the judges, ii. 130 sq.; organization of, under David, ii. 164; their subsequent history, ii. 187, 250, 252, 257, 260, 265.
Leydecker, i. 44.
Life eternal. *See* Immortality.
Living God, i. 147.
Logos, the, i. 193; ii. 441.
Long-suffering of God, i. 109, 179.
Lord, the, i. 143.
Lot, the, i. 177, 319.
Love of God, i. 256; to God, i. 267, ii. 451; to our neighbour, ii. 451.
Luther, i. 25, 39, 40, 41, 140, 163, 276; ii. 135, 259, 466.
Lutz, i. 64, 213.

Maimonides, i. 36; ii. 9, 19, 321, 323.
Maintenance of the world, i. 173.
Majus, i. 45.
Malachi, ii. 263, 266, 296.
Man, idea of, i. 210; elements of his nature, ii. 216.
Manasseh, the king, ii. 227; the priest, 263.
Manticism, ii. 321, 344 sqq.
Mantle of the prophets, ii. 193.
Marriage, its idea, i. 214, ii. 457; a symbol of the fellowship of God with Israel, ii. 301; law of, i. 333; conclusion of, i. 333; hindrances to, i. 334; dissolution of, i. 339; Roman law of, i. 338.
Megiddo, ii. 234.
Melancthon, i. 38, 40.
Melchizedek, i. 88, 90, 292; ii. 413.
Menahem, ii. 200.
Menken, i. 60, 62, 157.
Mercy of God, i. 127.
Merz, ii. 173 sq.
Messianic hope, the; discrepant features of, ii. 355, 406; its roots found in the Pentateuch, ii. 407; its foundation in a narrower sense, ii. 409; in the Psalms, ii. 410; in the earlier prophets, ii. 414; prophetic doctrine of the nature of Messiah, ii. 414; His office and work, ii. 422; His sufferings, ii. 423.

Naboth, i. 348.
Nadab, ii. 187.
Nägelsbach, E., i. 164.
Nahum, ii. 203, 229, 235.
Name of God, i. 181, 184.
Names, significance of, i. 283; giving of, i. 282, 284.
Nathan, ii. 158, 163, 169.
Nature, its relation to man, i. 228, ii. 387; contemplation of, i. 176, ii. 442.
Nazarites, ii. 17, 31, 34, 142.
Nebuchadnezzar, ii. 235, 337.
Necho, ii. 233.
Nehemiah, ii. 261.
New-moon, ii. 92, 250; ditto Sabbath, ii. 92 sq.
New year, ii. 92, 250.
Nitzsch, K. I., i. 69, 338, 370; ii. 441.
Noachian laws, i. 81 sq.
Noadiah, ii. 263.
Noah, i. 78, 241.
Numbering of the people, i. 113; ii. 156, 288.

Oath, the, a means of proof, i. 339; an act of worship, i. 374.
Oath of God, i. 255.
Obadiah, ii. 216, 241.
Obduracy, i. 178, 237.
Ode, ii. 293.
Oded, ii. 203.
Oetinger, i. 5, 46, 144, 160; ii. 437, 445, 460.
Oil, the, in the meat-offering, i. 408.
Omri, ii. 189.
Oppert, ii. 203 sq.
Origen, i. 35; ii. 321.
Oschwald, ii. 82.

Pan-offerings, i. 427.
Parents, authority and rights of, with respect to their children, i. 342; ii. 461.
Particularism, i. 261; overcome, ii. 205.
Passover, enactments concerning, ii. 108 sqq.; significance of, 113 sqq.; history of, ii. 223, 231.
Patriarchs, the, i. 87, 97; ii. 142.
Peace-offerings, their name and idea, ii. 1; division, ii. 2; material of, ii. 5; ritual of, ii. 5; existence of, in the times of the judges, ii. 130.
Pekah, ii. 201.

Digitized by Google

Pekahiah, ii. 201.
Penal enactments of the Mosaic law, i. 325.
Pentateuch, i. 13, 19; ii. 132.
Pentecost, ii. 117.
Perjury, i. 373.
Pharaoh, i. 101, 239.
Phul, ii. 200.
Pilgrimage feasts, ii. 108.
Plagues of Egypt, i. 102.
Pledges, laws concerning, i. 356.
Plural, quantitative and of majesty, i. 129, 131.
Plutarch, i. 30, 151.
Pœna vicaria, i. 411, 416; ii. 40, 55, 66.
Polygamy, i. 214, 334; ii. 458.
Polytheism, is it an assumption of Old Testament religion? i. 129, 150 sq., 197.
Præteritum propheticum, ii. 351.
Pragmatism, theocratic, ii. 147.
Prayer, i. 380; ii. 337.
Pre-existence of the soul, i. 220.
Priesthood, i. 292, 303; history of, ii. 162, 186, 208, 211 sq.
Priestly kingdom, i. 260.
Priests, towns of, i. 302; ii. 265.
Primitive state, i. 223, 227, 228, 230, 250, 265.
Prophecy, its general office, ii. 345; its prediction of individual occurrences, ii. 348; its peculiarities, ii. 351; its relation to fulfilment, ii. 349.
Prophecy of word and deed, ii. 207; medium of revelation, ii. 314; its history, ii. 141, 154, 180, 183 sqq., 190 sq., 192 sqq., 197, 209, 211, 245.
Prophetesses, ii. 240.
Prophetic books, connection between the, ii. 217.
Prophetic consciousness, the, ii. 313 sqq.; its definition by earlier, ii. 318 sqq.; and by Protestant theology, ii. 324 sqq.
Prophets, false, ii. 238, 240, 266, 314, 335.
Prophets, schools of the, ii. 144, 192.
Prophets, sons of the, ii. 192.
Prophetship, its position in the theocracy, nature and import, i. 320, ii. 139 sqq.
Protevangelium, i. 76; ii. 407.
Proudhon, i. 348; ii. 88.
Proverbs, Book of, ii. 453 sqq.
Providence, i. 175; ii. 474.
Psalms, ii. 159, 162, 424, 448, 455, 464, 467; Elohistic, i. 130, 134, 145; Messianic, ii. 411; imprecatory, ii. 467.
Psychology of nations, i. 85.
Purifications, Levitical, ii. 60 sqq.; from suspicion of guilt, ii. 63 sqq.
Purim, feast of, ii. 256.
Purpose of the world, i. 175 sq.

Queen-mother, ii. 210.

Raphael, ii. 287.
Rationalism, i. 50; ii. 330.
Raumer, K. v., i. 106.
Rechabites, ii. 195.
Red Sea, i. 101, 106.
Redemption, future, the, ii. 378.
Redemption of family possessions, i. 348.
Reformations in Judah, ii. 209, 213.
Rehoboam, ii. 181, 206.
Religious syncretism, i. 99; ii. 133 sq.
Remnant of Israel, ii. 382; of the heathen, ii. 398.
Repentance of God, ii. 358, 361.
Resurrection, ii. 393 sqq., 471.
Retribution, Mosaic doctrine of, i. 284 sqq.; its relation to Divine election, i. 287 sq.; attacks upon, i. 288; reflection of the Khochmah upon, ii. 463, 472, 480.
Return of the Jews, ii. 248 sqq.
Reuchlin, i. 37, 39.
Revelation, i. 20 sqq.; general, i. 22; special, i. 23; forms of, i. 187 sqq.
Revelation side of the Divine nature, i. 181.
Rezin, ii. 219 sq.
Riehm, i. 301, 330; ii. 30.
Rights with God, ii. 464.
Rinck, ii. 29.
Ritter, K., i. 108, 123, 210.
Rod, Aaron's, i. 304.
Roos, M. F., i. 46, 48, 210.
Rothe, i. 11 sq., ii. 340.
Rougemont, ii. 311.
Rupprecht, i. 157, 159.
Rust, i. 51.
Ruth, ii. 154.

Saalschutz, i. 323, 362; ii. 100.
Sabaoth. *See* Jehovah.
Sabbath: creation Sabbath, i. 73; weekly Sabbath, antiquity and origin of, ii. 74 sqq.; idea of, ii. 84 sqq.; celebration of, ii. 88.
Sabbatic seasons, ii. 74.
Sabbatic year, the, law of, ii. 94; import of, ii. 103; practicability of keeping, ii. 105.
Sack, K. H., i. 69.
Sacrifice, notion of, i. 388; pre-Mosaic, i. 77 sq., i. 81, 391, 394; origin of, i. 395; material of, i. 397, 399;

Digitized by Google

principle on which the material is fixed, i. 406; ritual of, i. 409; kinds of, ii. 1 sq.
Sacrificial doctrine of the prophets. *See* Cultus of the Khochmah, ii. 449.
Sacrificial flesh, consumption of, by the priests, ii. 39.
Sacrificial repasts, ii. 12.
Salem, i. 90.
Salt, i. 404.
Salvation, experience of, i. 27; ii. 309.
Samaria, ii. 189, 200.
Samaritans, ii. 204 sq., 251, 263, 265.
Samson, ii. 21 sq.
Samuel, ii. 137, 141, 151; Books of, 155.
Sanballat, ii. 263.
Sanctuary, Mosaic, arrangement of, i. 375; signification of its parts, i. 378; and vessels, i. 380; tribute for, ii. 27.
Sargon, ii. 203.
Satan, i. 231; ii. 51, 288.
Saul, i. 209; ii. 153, 289.
Schelling, i. 51, 91; ii. 62.
Schleiden, i. 106.
Schleiermacher, i. 4, 31 sq.; ii. 350.
Schmid, Ch. F., i. 8, 14.
Schmid, S., i. 46.
Schmieder, i. 158; ii. 294, 420.
Schnell, i. 323 sq.; ii. 106.
Scholasticism, i. 36 sq.
Schrader, i. 198.
Schultz, i. 24, 61, 142, 153, 191, 213, 275, 388; ii. 286, 412.
Scorners, ii. 180.
Scribes, ii. 267.
Scythians, ii. 233.
Seasons, sacred, review of, ii. 68; designations of, ii. 69; times of, ii. 71; celebration of, ii. 74.
Semler, i. 47.
Sennacherib, ii. 221.
Seraphim, ii. 281 sq.
Serpent, brazen, i. 113, 114.
Servant, the, of the Lord, i. 262; ii. 400, 425.
Servile classes, i. 353; Israelite, i. 356; non-Israelite, i. 363.
Seven, the number, i. 382; ii. 71, 77, 82, 87, 284.
Sexual relation of man and woman, i. 213.
Shallum, ii. 200.
Shalmanezer, ii. 203.
Shamgar, ii. 125.
Shemaiah, the prophet, ii. 181; the false prophet, ii. 240.
Shew-bread, i. 377, 381.
Shiloh, ii. 408.
Shishak, ii. 210.
Shukford, i. 47.
Simeon, i. 95, 113, 116, 117, 344; ii. 181.
Sin, origin of, i. 75, 229 sqq.; a disturbance of the aim of the world, i. 176; its relation to Divine causality, i. 177; Old Testament names of, i. 231; an inclination, i. 235; hereditary, i. 236; resistible, i. 238; degrees of, i. 239; increasingly profound perception of, in the prophets, ii. 299; forgiveness of, ii. 309, 383.
Sin-offering, definition of, ii. 29, 33; ritual of, ii. 36; import of, ii. 39; not mentioned in the Book of Judges, ii. 130; lacking in the days of redemption, ii. 295.
Sirach, ii. 452.
Slaughter of the victim, i. 411.
Slaves, i. 353 sq., 363 sqq.; female, i. 355, 365.
So, ii. 202.
Solomon, reign of, ii. 169 sq.; founder of the Khochmah, ii. 177; Song of, ii. 458.
Song, sacred, i. 344; ii. 145, 157, 159, 163.
Sonship, Divine, ii. 312; of the people, i. 259, ii. 300; of the king, ii. 161; of Messiah, ii. 411.
Sopherism, ii. 267 sq.
Spencer, i. 47, 48, 394.
Spener, i. 46.
Spirit, Holy, the, of God, i. 163; in creation, i. 172; in preservation, i. 173; the vehicle of revelation, i. 180, 194, ii. 140, 315; the principle of regeneration, ii. 311, 383.
Spirit, the, of man, i. 216.
Spirituality of God, i. 163.
Steudel, i. 9, 32, 60, 63, 191.
Stickel, ii. 476.
Stier, i. 18; ii. 416, 463, 469.
Substitution, i. 389 sq.; ii. 425.
Suffering, import of, ii. 423, 461, 472 sqq.
Sulpicius Severus, i. 34, 36.
Supernaturalism, earlier, i. 25 sqq., 60 sqq., ii. 327.
Susannah, Book of, ii. 245.
Symbolism, prophetic, ii. 333.
Synagogues, ii. 211, 246, 268 sq.

TABERNACLE, i. 375 sq.; ii. 129, 133, 157, 170.
Tabernacles, feast of, ii. 119.
Table of nations, i. 82.
Tamar, ii. 335.
Temple, of Solomon, preparation for, ii. 162; building of, ii. 169; description of, ii. 171; vessels of, ii. 172; significance of, ii. 174; dedication, ii. 175; in the latter days, ii. 403.

Digitized by Google

Ten, the number, i. 268, 273.
Ten tribes, kingdom of, ii. 184.
Teraphim, i. 83, 86.
Tertullian, i. 35; ii. 320, 395.
Testament, Old, practical import of, i. 1 sq.; Old and New, their mutual relation, i. 3, 28 sq., 61, ii. 468, 485; their relation to heathenism, i. 61.
Thank-offering, i. 428.
Thenius, ii. 149, 232.
Theocracy, i. 289.
Theodidasklia of the new covenant, ii. 384.
Theodoret, ii. 255, 258.
Theology, biblical, the name, i. 49; method of, i. 65; Old Testament notion of, i. 7 sq.; importance to divinity, i. 5; relation to other Old Testament subjects, i. 10; history of, i. 33; divisions of, i. 67.
Theophany, i. 145, 180.
Thiersch, i. 337.
Tholuck, ii. 315, 321, 335, 361.
Tibni, ii. 188.
Tiglath-Pileser, ii. 219.
Tirzah, ii. 189.
Tithes, ii. 26.
Topics, i. 46.
Tribes, heads of, i. 331.
Tributes, the theocratic, ii. 25.
Trichotomy, i. 219.
Trinity, the, i. 129, 193, 207.
Trumpets, sounding of, i. 91.
Tutelary spirits, national, ii. 286.

Umbreit, i. 50, 210, 212; ii. 403, 411, 415.
Unchangeableness of God, ii. 139, 146.
Unity of God, i. 150.
Universalism, ii. 365.
Urijah, the prophet, ii. 235.
Urim and Thummim, i. 314, 319; ii. 268.
Uzziah, ii. 214, 216.

Vatke, i. 51, 59, 70; ii. 132, 142, 176, 189, 228, 275, 344.
Viktoriner, i. 34.
Vilmar, ii. 22.
Visions, i. 208; ii. 333.
Vitringa, i. 44; ii. 147, 326, 334.
Voice, the Divine, i. 187.
Vows, ii. 13.

Warburton, i. 47.
Watchman, prophetic office of, ii. 144, 152, 332.
Water of cursing, ii. 63.
Waving, i. 300; ii. 6.
Week, the cycle of, ii. 78.
Weeks, feast of, ii. 117.
Winer, ii. 258.
Wisdom, Old Testament, i. 68, ii. 177; documents of, ii. 432; relation to revelation and to worldly wisdom, ii. 432; its principle of knowledge, ii. 436; form, ii. 437; Divine wisdom, ii. 439; its personification, ii. 441; its part in the universe, 439; its intervention in human affairs, ii. 444; human wisdom, ii. 446; practical, ii. 448; Book of, i. 19, 221.
Witsius, i. 44; ii. 10, 312, 326.
Word, the, its position in worship, i. 370 sq.
Word of God, i. 137, 169, 187; ii. 441.
World, the, ages of, i. 71; covenant of, i. 81.
World, the, kingdoms of, ii. 377. *See* also Gentiles.
Worship, nature of, i. 367; state of, in the times of the judges, ii. 128; under David, ii. 162; after the captivity, ii. 267 sq.; prophetic view of, ii. 294; place of, i. 374.
Wrath of God, i. 166.

Xerxes, ii. 206.

Year, beginning of, ii. 193.

Zachariæ, i. 50, 52.
Zachariah, the king, ii. 199; the prophet, ii. 214, 216.
Zadok, the high priest, ii. 162; the scribe, ii. 269.
Zechariah, ii. 253, 333, 429.
Zedekiah, the king, ii. 238; the false prophet, ii. 241.
Zephaniah, ii. 218, 231, 233.
Zerah, ii. 210.
Zerubbabel, ii. 249.
Zimri, ii. 187.
Zion, ii. 157.
Zöckler, ii. 435, 444, 449, 454, 456.

Digitized by Google

INDEX OF TEXTS.

	PAGE
Matt. iii. 4,	Vol. ii. 193
iii. 17,	i. 187
xi. 8,	ii. 193
xi. 11,	ii. 312
xi. 13 sq.,	i. 16, 18
xvi. 14,	ii. 244
xvii. 3,	i. 118
xvii. 5,	i. 187
xviii. 25,	i. 357
xix. 6,	i. 214
xix. 7,	i. 340
xix. 8,	i. 290, 341
xix. 18,	i. 273
xxii. 24 sqq.,	i. 347
xxii. 30,	i. 213
xxii. 32,	i. 253
xxiv.,	ii. 353
xxvi. 63,	i. 373
xxviii. 19,	i. 183
Mark vii. 11,	i. 389
ix. 49,	i. 404
x. 19,	i. 270, 273, 275
Luke i. 10,	i. 380
i. 15,	ii. 18
i. 59,	i. 282
ii. 21,	i. 282
ii. 22 sqq.,	i. 343
ii. 36,	ii. 253
iv. 21,	ii. 105
ix. 30 sq.,	i. 118
ix. 55,	ii. 468
xii. 1,	i. 405
xvi. 29,	i. 252
xviii. 20,	i. 273
xx. 28,	i. 346
xx. 36,	i. 213
xxiv. 44,	i. 16
John i. 14,	i. 200
iii. 14 sq.,	i. 112, 114
iii. 27,	ii. 338
iii. 30,	ii. 264
iv. 12,	ii. 204
vi. 45,	ii. 141, 384
vii. 37,	ii. 120
viii. 12,	ii. 120
viii. 44,	i. 231
xi. 51,	ii. 317, 337
xii. 28,	i. 187
John xiv. 23,	Vol. i. 200
Acts i. 7,	ii. 352
iii. 1,	i. 425
iii. 24,	ii. 138
iv. 7,	i. 185
vii. 22 sqq.,	i. 101, 102
viii. 37,	i. 223, 226
xvii. 26,	i. 81, 215
xvii. 27 sq.,	i. 22
xxvi. 7,	i. 293
xxvii. 9,	ii. 43
Rom. iii. 2,	ii. 262
vii. 7,	i. 275
viii. 21,	ii. 104
ix. 3,	i. 109
ix. 8,	i. 87, 89
x. 9 sq.,	i. 223, 226
xi. 5,	ii. 262
xi. 25–36,	i. 16, 288, ii. 362
xiii. 9,	i. 270, 273
xvi. 20,	i. 231
1 Cor. v. 6–8,	i. 405
v. 7 sq.,	ii. 114
viii. 4 sqq.,	i. 153
x. 4,	i. 195
x. 17,	ii. 115
x. 19 sq.,	i. 153
xi. 8 sq.,	i. 213
xiii. 9,	ii. 356
xiii. 12,	i. 206
xiv. 24 sq.,	ii. 148
2 Cor. i. 20,	ii. 356
iii. 3,	ii. 384
vii. 3,	i. 318
xii. 2–4,	ii. 336
Eph. ii. 12,	i. 29
vi. 2,	i. 276
Phil. i. 7,	i. 318
1 Tim. ii. 13,	i. 213
Heb. iv. 9,	ii. 85, 105
v. 2,	ii. 50
v. 3,	i. 313
v. 4,	i. 292
vi. 17,	i. 257
viii. 5,	i. 379
ix. 6 sqq.,	ii. 57
ix. 7,	ii. 50, 54
Heb. ix. 8,	Vol. i. 383
ix. 14,	ii. 418
ix. 19,	ii. 418
xi.,	ii. 307
xi. 4,	i. 78
xi. 7,	i. 79
xi. 22,	i. 95
xi. 37,	ii. 193
xi. 40,	i. 118, ii. 312, 478
xii. 23,	i. 250
Jas. ii. 11,	i. 273
v. 4,	ii. 272
1 Pet. i. 10–12,	i. 67, ii. 342
i. 11,	ii. 354
ii. 9,	i. 260
iii. 19,	i. 250
iii. 20 sq.,	i. 80
iv. 17,	ii. 371
2 Pet. i. 20,	i. 67
1 John ii.,	i. 20, ii. 384
Jude 9,	i. 118
Rev. i. sqq.,	i. 382
i. 1,	ii. 351
i. 4,	i. 135
i. 6,	i. 260
i. 13–15,	ii. 285
i. 17,	ii. 328
iv. 6 sqq.,	i. 385
iv. 8,	i. 135, 387, ii. 281
v. 8,	i. 380
v. 10,	i. 260
vi. 9,	i. 250
vii. 4 sqq.,	i. 293
vii. 15,	i. 200
viii. 3 sq.,	i. 380
x. 9 sq.,	ii. 331
xi. 17,	i. 135
xii. 7 sqq.,	ii. 287
xii. 9,	i. 231
xii. 10,	ii. 291
xvi. 5,	i. 135
xix. 14,	ii. 279
xx. 8,	ii. 373
xxii. 6–12,	i. 192

Digitized by Google

INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS.

אָדוֹן, i. 148.
אֲדֹנָי, i. 129, 134, 148 sq.
אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, i. 375.
אוֹב, i. 249.
אָוֶן, i. 233.
אַזְכָּרָה, i. 421 sq.
אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, ii. 352.
אֵל, i. 127 sq., 132, 144 sqq.
אֱלוֹהַּ, i. 127 sq., 144.
אֱלֹהִים, i. 127 sqq., 144 sqq.
אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים, i. 151.
אֵלִיל, i. 153.
אֲלָפִים, i. 331, 332.
אֵל שַׁדַּי, i. 100, 166 sqq.
אֶמֶה, i. 355.
אֱמֶת, נֶאֱמָן, הֶאֱמִין, אֱמוּנָה, ii. 306.
אֱנוֹשׁ, i. 244.
אַרְפַּכְשַׁד, i. 84.
אִשָּׁה, i. 389.

בְּאֵר, i. 116.
בּוֹר, i. 248, 251.
בָּחַר, i. 257.
בִּינָה, ii. 451.
בֵּית אָבוֹת, i. 331.
בְּנֵי נְבִיאִים, ii. 194, 196.
בַּעַז, ii. 171, 174, 176.
בָּרָא, i. 169.
בָּשָׂר, i. 174.
בְּשַׁנְנָה, i. 239, ii. 29.
בַּת קוֹל, i. 187.

גְּאֵל, i. 350.
גְּבוּרוֹת, i. 202.
גַּבְרִיאֵל, ii. 284 sq.
גּוֹיִם, i. 261.
גּוֹלָה, ii. 215.
גָּעַשׁ, i. 246.

דְּבִיר, ii. 170, 173.

הֵבִיא, i. 409.
הָוָה, i. 413.
הֲנִיף, ii. 7.
הִקְטִיר, i. 420.
הִקְרִיב, i. 409.
הָרִים, ii. 7 sq., 11.

זֶבַח, זָבַח, i. 397.
זֶרַע, ii. 408.
זָרַק, i. 413.

חַג, ii. 70.
חָזוֹת, חָזוֹן, חִזָּיוֹן, חָזָה, i. 208, ii. 332, 334.
חֵטְא, חַטָּאת, חָטָא, i. 233, ii. 44.
חַי יְהוָה, i. 147 sq.
חִידוֹת, ii. 438.
חָכְמָה, חָכָם, ii. 432.
חֲכָמִים, ii. 177.
חִלָּל, חָלַל, i. 155.
חֵרֶם, i. 397, ii. 13.

יָדַע, i. 256.
יָהּ, i. 136.
יְהוּדִים, ii. 183.
יְהוָה, i. 134.
יוֹבֵל, ii. 96.
יָכִין, ii. 171, 174.
יָצָק, i. 316, ii. 153.
יֵצֶר לֵב, i. 235.

כְּבוֹד יְהוָה, i. 186.
כֹּהֵן, i. 304, 309.
כָּלִיל, i. 424.
כִּפֶּר, כִּפֻּר, i. 414.
כַּפֹּרֶת, i. 377, 384.
כָּרַת בְּרִית, i. 254 sqq.

לֵב, לֵבָב, i. 221 sqq.
לֵצִים, ii. 180.

מֹהַר, i. 333.
מוּסָר, ii. 445.
מוֹעֲדִים, ii. 69.
מוֹפֵת, i. 202 sq.
מְזִמָּה, ii. 451.
מַטּוֹת, i. 291, 293.
מִיכָאֵל, ii. 284 sq.
מְלֵא אֶת־יַד פ׳, i. 311.
מְלָאִים, i. 306.
מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה, i. 145, 188 sqq.
מִנְחָה, i. 389, 398, 404 sqq.
מַעֲשִׂים, i. 202.
מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ, ii. 75.
מַשָּׂא, ii. 334.
מָשִׁיחַ, ii. 407.
מָשָׁל, ii. 437 sq.
מִשְׁרַת, i. 263, 309.

נְאֻם יְהוָה, ii. 333.
נָבִיא, נָבָא, ii. 140, 318.

Digitized by Google

נְדָבָה, ii. 2 sqq.
נָדָר, ii. 2.
נָזִיר, ii. 17.
הִתְנַחֵם, נִחַם, i. 166.
נִפְלָאוֹת, i. 202.
נֶפֶשׁ, i. 246 sqq.
נְשָׁמָה, i. 217, 246.
נְתִינִים, i. 217.

סֶלָה, ii. 93.
סֻכָּת, i. 403.

עֶבֶד יְהוָה, i. 263, 309, ii. 399, 425.
עֵבֶר, i. 84.
עֲזָאזֵל, ii. 45, 51, 292.
עָוֹן, i. 233.
עָכוֹר, i. 120.
עֵלָה, i. 424 sqq., ii. 130.
עֶלְיוֹן, i. 130 sqq.
עֲלִילוֹת, i. 202.
עָנָה, ii. 336.
עֲצֶרֶת, ii. 119 sq.
עֲרוַת דָּבָר, i. 340.
עֶרְמָה, ii. 451.
עַתּוּד, i. 401.

פֶּלֶא, i. 202.
פֶּסַח, ii. 112.
פָּשַׁע, i. 233.
פְּתִי, ii. 446.

צְבָאוֹת, ii. 270 sq.
צַדָּקָה, צַדִּיק, i. 164, 240, 263 sq., ii. 263.
צוּר, i. 165, 283.
צֶמַח, ii. 415, 416.
צָפִים, מְצַפִּים, ii. 146, 332.

קָדוֹשׁ, i. 154 sqq., 183.
קָדֵשׁ, i. 155, 156.
קְדֵשָׁה, i. 156.
קֶטֶן, i. 422.
קְנָאָה, קִנֵּא, i. 166 sqq.
קָרֵב, i. 221, 224.
קָרְבָּן, i. 389.

רֹאֶה, רָאָה, ii. 332, 334.
רוּחַ, i. 172, 205 sqq., 218 sqq.
רֹחַב, i. 175 sq.
רְפָאִים, i. 249.

שָׂעִיר, i. 401.
שְׁאוֹל, i. 247 sqq., ii. 392, 454, 466, 481.
שְׁאֵרִית יַעֲקֹב, ii. 382.
שְׁבָטִים, i. 291.
שַׁבָּת, ii. 74, 77.
שַׁדַּי, i. 132 sqq., 183.
שְׁדִים, i. 133 sq., 153.
שׁוֹק, ii. 7 sq.
שְׂטָרִים, i. 98 sq., 323.
שְׁכִינָה, i. 163, 199 sqq.
שְׁלָמִים, ii. 1 sqq.
שֵׁם הַמְפֹרָשׁ, i. 134, 137, 140.
שְׁמָמָה, i. 355.

תּוֹכַחַת, ii. 445.
תּוֹשִׁיָּה, ii. 452.
תַּחְבֻּלוֹת, ii. 451.
תְּנוּפָה, ii. 6, 10.
תַּרְוֵמָה, i. 208.
תְּרוּמָה, ii. 7, 10.

THE END.

MURRAY AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

LANGE'S
COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

Translations of the Commentaries of Dr. Lange and his Collaborateurs on the Old and New Testaments.

Edited by Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF.

There are now ready (in imperial 8vo, double columns), price 21s. per Volume,

OLD TESTAMENT, Eight Volumes:

COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF GENESIS, in One Volume.
COMMENTARY ON JOSHUA, JUDGES, AND RUTH, in One Volume.
COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF KINGS, in One Volume.
COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF JOB.
COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS, in One Volume.
COMMENTARY ON PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES, AND THE SONG OF SOLOMON, in One Volume.
COMMENTARY ON JEREMIAH AND LAMENTATIONS, in One Volume.
COMMENTARY ON MINOR PROPHETS, in One Volume.

The other Books of the Old Testament are in active preparation, and will be announced as soon as ready.

NEW TESTAMENT (now complete), Ten Volumes:

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW.
COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPELS OF ST. MARK and ST. LUKE.
COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.
COMMENTARY ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.
COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.
COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.
COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS, and COLOSSIANS.
COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS, TIMOTHY, TITUS, PHILEMON, and HEBREWS.
COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF JAMES, PETER, JOHN, and JUDE.
COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF REVELATION.

'Lange's comprehensive and elaborate "Bibelwerk." . . . We hail its publication as a valuable addition to the stores of our Biblical literature.'—*Edinburgh Review.*

The price to Subscribers to the Foreign Theological Library, St. Augustine's Works, and Ante-Nicene Library, and Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament, or to Purchasers of Complete Sets of the Commentary (so far as published), will be

FIFTEEN SHILLINGS PER VOLUME.

Dr. LANGE'S Commentary on the Gospels and Acts (without Dr. SCHAFF'S Notes) is also published in the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, in Nine Volumes demy 8vo, and may be had in that form if desired. (For particulars, see List of Foreign Theological Library.)

Digitized by Google

The Works of St. Augustine.

EDITED BY MARCUS DODS, D.D.

SUBSCRIPTION:

Four Volumes for a Guinea, *payable in advance* (24s. when not paid in advance).

FIRST YEAR.

THE 'CITY OF GOD.' Two Volumes.

WRITINGS IN CONNECTION WITH the Donatist Controversy. In One Volume.

THE ANTI-PELAGIAN WORKS OF St. Augustine. Vol. I.

SECOND YEAR.

'LETTERS.' Vol. I.

TREATISES AGAINST FAUSTUS the Manichæan. One Volume.

THE HARMONY OF THE EVANgelists, and the Sermon on the Mount. One Volume.

ON THE TRINITY. One Volume.

THIRD YEAR.

COMMENTARY ON JOHN. Two Volumes.

ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, ENCHIRIDION, ON CATECHIZING, and ON FAITH AND THE CREED. One Volume.

THE ANTI-PELAGIAN WORKS OF St. Augustine. Vol. II.

Messrs. CLARK believe this will prove not the least valuable of their various Series, and no pains will be spared to make it so. The Editor has secured a most competent staff of Translators, and every care is being taken to secure not only accuracy, but elegance.

The Works of ST. AUGUSTINE to be included in the Series are (in addition to the above)—

The remaining TREATISES in the PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY;

The CONFESSIONS; and LETTERS, Vol. II.

The Series will include a LIFE of ST. AUGUSTINE, by ROBERT RAINY, D.D., Principal and Professor of Church History, New College, Edinburgh.

It is understood that Subscribers are bound to take at least the books of the first two years. Each Volume is sold separately at (on an average) 10s. 6d.

'For the reproduction of the "City of God" in an admirable English garb we are greatly indebted to the well-directed enterprise and energy of Messrs. Clark, and to the accuracy and scholarship of those who have undertaken the laborious task of translation.'—*Christian Observer.*

'The present translation reads smoothly and pleasantly, and we have every reason to be satisfied both with the erudition and the fair and sound judgment displayed by the translators and the editor.'—*John Bull.*

Digitized by Google

(TEMPORARY) CHEAP RE-ISSUE OF

STIER'S WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS.

To meet a very general desire that this now well-known Work should be brought more within the reach of all classes, both Clergy and Laity, Messrs. CLARK are now issuing, for a limited period, the *Eight* Volumes, handsomely bound in *Four*, at the *Subscription price* of

TWO GUINEAS.

As the allowance to the Trade must necessarily be small, orders sent either direct or through booksellers must *in every case* be accompanied with a Post Office Order for the above amount.

'The whole work is a treasury of thoughtful exposition. Its measure of practical and spiritual application, with exegetical criticism, commends it to the use of those whose duty it is to preach as well as to understand the Gospel of Christ.'—*Guardian.*

New and Cheap Edition, in Four Vols. Demy 8vo, *Subscription price* 28s.

THE LIFE OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST:

A Complete Critical Examination of the Origin, Contents, and Connection of the Gospels. Translated from the German of J. P. LANGE, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Bonn. Edited, with additional Notes, by MARCUS DODS, D.D.

'We have arrived at a most favourable conclusion regarding the importance and ability of this work—the former depending upon the present condition of theological criticism, the latter on the wide range of the work itself; the singularly dispassionate judgment of the author, as well as his pious, reverential, and erudite treatment of a subject inexpressibly holy. . . . We have great pleasure in recommending this work to our readers. We are convinced of its value and enormous range.'—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

BENGEL'S GNOMON—CHEAP EDITION.

GNOMON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By JOHN ALBERT BENGEL. Now First Translated into English. With Original Notes, Explanatory and Illustrative. Edited by the Rev. ANDREW R. FAUSSET, M.A. The Original Translation was in Five Large Volumes, demy 8vo, averaging more than 550 pages each, and the very great demand for this edition has induced the Publishers to issue the *Five* Volumes bound in *Three*, at the *Subscription price* of

TWENTY-FOUR SHILLINGS.

They trust by this still further to increase its usefulness.

'It is a work which manifests the most intimate and profound knowledge of Scripture, and which, if we examine it with care, will often be found to condense more matter into a life than can be extracted from many pages of other writers.'—Archdeacon HARE.

'In respect both of its contents and its tone, Bengel's Gnomon stands alone. Even among laymen there has arisen a healthy and vigorous desire for scriptural knowledge, and Bengel has done more than any other man to aid such inquirers. There is perhaps no book every word of which has been so well weighed, or in which a single technical term contains so often far-reaching and suggestive views. . . . The theoretical and practical are as intimately connected as light and heat in the sun's ray.'—*Life of Perthes.*

Digitized by Google

In Twenty-four Handsome 8vo Volumes, Subscription Price £6, 6s. od.,

Ante-Nicene Christian Library.

A COLLECTION OF ALL THE WORKS OF THE FATHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA.

EDITED BY THE

REV. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D.D., AND JAMES DONALDSON, LL.D.

MESSRS. CLARK are now happy to announce the completion of this Series. It has been received with marked approval by all sections of the Christian Church in this country and in the United States, as supplying what has long been felt to be a want, and also on account of the impartiality, learning, and care with which Editors and Translators have executed a very difficult task.

The Publishers do not bind themselves to *continue* to supply the Series at the Subscription price.

The Works are arranged as follow:—

FIRST YEAR.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS, comprising Clement's Epistles to the Corinthians; Polycarp to the Ephesians; Martyrdom of Polycarp; Epistle of Barnabas; Epistles of Ignatius (longer and shorter, and also the Syriac version); Martyrdom of Ignatius; Epistle to Diognetus; Pastor of Hermas; Papias; Spurious Epistles of Ignatius. In One Volume.

JUSTIN MARTYR; ATHENAGORAS. In One Volume.

TATIAN; THEOPHILUS; THE CLEMENTINE Recognitions. In One Volume.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, Volume First, comprising Exhortation to Heathen; The Instructor; and a portion of the Miscellanies.

SECOND YEAR.

HIPPOLYTUS, Volume First; Refutation of all Heresies, and Fragments from his Commentaries.

IRENÆUS, Volume First.

TERTULLIAN AGAINST MARCION.

CYPRIAN, Volume First; the Epistles, and some of the Treatises.

THIRD YEAR.

IRENÆUS (completion); HIPPOLYTUS (completion); Fragments of Third Century. In One Volume.

ORIGEN: De Principiis; Letters; and portion of Treatise against Celsus.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, Volume Second; Completion of Miscellanies.

TERTULLIAN, Volume First; To the Martyrs; Apology; To the Nations, etc.

FOURTH YEAR.

CYPRIAN, Volume Second (completion); Novatian; Minucius Felix; Fragments.

METHODIUS; ALEXANDER OF LYcopolis; Peter of Alexandria; Anatolius; Clement on Virginity; and Fragments.

TERTULLIAN, Volume Second.

APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, ACTS, AND Revelations; comprising all the very curious Apocryphal Writings of the first three Centuries.

FIFTH YEAR.

TERTULLIAN, Volume Third (completion).

CLEMENTINE HOMILIES; APOSTOlical Constitutions. In One Volume.

ARNOBIUS.

DIONYSIUS; GREGORY THAUMAturgus; Syrian Fragments. In One Volume.

SIXTH YEAR.

LACTANTIUS; Two Volumes.

ORIGEN, Volume Second (completion). 12s. to Non-Subscribers.

EARLY LITURGIES AND REMAINing Fragments. 9s. to Non-Subscribers.

Single Years cannot be had separately, unless to complete sets; but any Volume may be had separately, price 10s. 6d.,—with the exception of ORIGEN, Vol. II., 12s.; and the EARLY LITURGIES, 9s.

Digitized by Google

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

PASTORAL THEOLOGY,

A TREATISE ON THE OFFICE AND DUTIES OF THE CHRISTIAN PASTOR.

By the Late PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D.,

PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

WITH A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR.

'This treatise on the office and duties of a Christian pastor, by the late Professor Fairbairn, is well deserving thoughtful perusal. Throughout the volume, however, there is a tone of earnest piety and practical good sense, which finds expression in many profitable counsels, embodying the result of large experience and shrewd observation. . . . Much of the volume is devoted to the theory and practice of preaching, and this part we can most heartily commend; it is replete with valuable suggestions, which even those who have had some experience in the ministry will find calculated to make them more attractive and efficient preachers.'—*Christian Observer.*

'This work is pervaded throughout by an earnest zeal for the interests of religion, as well as for the prosperity of the Church to which the author belonged, and is on the whole free from the charge of intolerance and bigotry.'—*Scotsman.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

The Greek Text and Translation.

WITH INTRODUCTION, EXPOSITORY NOTES, AND DISSERTATIONS.

'We cordially recommend this work to ministers and theological students.'—*Methodist Magazine.*

'We have read no book of his with a keener appreciation and enjoyment than that just published on the Pastoral Epistles.'—*Nonconformist.*

'The work is in every way worthy of Dr. Fairbairn's high reputation. Nay, more, it will enhance it. Wide and well-digested learning, accurate scholarship, thorough independence of thought exercised in a calm and serious spirit, sound judgment, ripe Christian experience, distinguish this work.'—*London Weekly Review.*

'Dr. Fairbairn deserves our best thanks for this meritorious work of conscientious criticism and careful exposition of a portion of Scripture which has not received so much attention as it merits.'—*Daily Review.*

'Dr. Fairbairn has done essential service by this very scholarly and able work, in which he deals vigorously with the critical questions of our own day.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

'The work is indeed a complete exegesis of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, and embraces all the critical and controversial questions to which they have given rise.'—*Rock.*

Digitized by Google

MEYER'S
Commentary on the New Testament.

MESSRS. CLARK beg to announce that they have in course of preparation a Translation of the well-known and justly esteemed

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL

COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT,

By Dr. H. A. W. MEYER,

OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER,

Of which they have published—

FIRST YEAR.

ROMANS, Two Vols.
GALATIANS, One Volume.
ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, Vol. I.

SECOND YEAR.

FIRST ISSUE.

ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, Vol. II.
PHILIPPIANS AND COLOSSIANS.

The Subscription is 21s. for Four Volumes, Demy 8vo, payable in advance.

In order to secure perfect accuracy, the Publishers have placed the whole work under the editorial care of Rev. Dr. DICKSON, Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, and Rev. Dr. CROMBIE, Professor of Biblical Criticism, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews.

Each Volume will be sold separately at (on an average) 10s. 6d. to Non-Subscribers.

Intending Subscribers will be kind enough to send their orders either direct to the Publishers at 38 George Street, Edinburgh, or through their own Booksellers.

'I need hardly add that the last edition of the accurate, perspicuous, and learned commentary of Dr. Meyer has been most carefully consulted throughout; and I must again, as in the preface to the Galatians, avow my great obligations to the acumen and scholarship of the learned editor.'—BISHOP ELLICOTT *in Preface to his 'Commentary on Ephesians.'*

'Meyer has been long and well known to scholars as one of the very ablest of the German expositors of the New Testament. We are not sure whether we ought not to say that he is *unrivalled* as an interpreter of the grammatical and historical meaning of the sacred writers. The publishers have now rendered another seasonable and important service to English students in producing this translation.'—*Guardian.*

'The ablest grammatical exegete of the age.'—PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google